

9570. By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Petition urging the enactment of the stop-alien-representation amendment resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9571. By Mr. STALKER: Petition of Rev. Asa A. Nichols and 20 other residents of Breesport, N. Y., urging support of the stop-alien-representation amendment to cut out aliens, and count only American citizens, when making future apportionments for congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9572. Also, petition of Bertha W. Myers and 50 other residents of Horseheads, N. Y., urging support of the stop-alien-representation amendment to the United States Constitution to cut out aliens and count only American citizens when making future apportionments for congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9573. By Mr. TREADWAY: Petition of citizens of Westfield, Mass., urging the adoption of the constitutional amendment to eliminate alien population in connection with future apportionments for congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9574. Also, petition of citizens of Williamstown, Fla., and North Adams, Mass., urging adoption of constitutional amendment to eliminate alien population in connection with future apportionments for congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9575. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the City Council of the City of Chicago, protesting against a proposed removal of river and harbor work from the jurisdiction of the Secretary of War; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

SENATE

SATURDAY, JANUARY 14, 1933

(Legislative day of Tuesday, January 10, 1933)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to enable me to make a point of no quorum?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. GLASS. I yield.

Mr. FESS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Cutting	Johnson	Schall
Austin	Dale	Kendrick	Schuyler
Bailey	Davis	Keyes	Sheppard
Bankhead	Dickinson	King	Shortridge
Barbour	Dill	La Follette	Smith
Barkley	Fess	Lewis	Smoot
Bingham	Fletcher	Logan	Steiner
Black	Frazier	Long	Swanson
Blaine	George	McGill	Thomas, Idaho
Borah	Glass	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Bratton	Glenn	McNary	Townsend
Broussard	Goldsborough	Metcalf	Trammell
Bulkley	Gore	Moses	Tydings
Bulow	Grammer	Norbeck	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Hale	Norris	Wagner
Capper	Harrison	Nye	Walcott
Caraway	Hastings	Oddie	Walsh, Mass.
Carey	Hatfield	Patterson	Walsh, Mont.
Connally	Hawes	Pittman	Watson
Coolidge	Hayden	Reynolds	Wheeler
Copeland	Hebert	Robinson, Ark.	White
Costigan	Howell	Robinson, Ind.	
Couzens	Hull	Russell	

Mr. HARRISON. I desire to announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS] is necessarily detained from the Senate by illness. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD].

I also wish to announce the absence of the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART] on account of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The Senate will receive a message from the President of the United States.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

CLAIMS ARISING FROM EXPLOSIONS AT LAKE DENMARK, N. J.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, submitting, pursuant to law, a report with his recommendations thereon of certain claims transmitted to him by the Secretary of the Navy covering property damage, death, or personal injury resulting from the explosions at the naval ammunition depot, Lake Denmark, N. J., on July 10, 1926, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. BLAINE presented memorials of sundry citizens of Kimball, Nebr., remonstrating against the repeal or modification of the national prohibition law, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DILL presented memorials signed by 579 citizens of College Place and vicinity, in the State of Washington, remonstrating against the passage of legislation to repeal or modify the national prohibition law, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FESS presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Mount Vernon and vicinity, in the State of Ohio, remonstrating against the passage of legislation to repeal or modify the national prohibition law, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. VANDENBERG presented a memorial, numerous signed, of sundry citizens of Berrien Springs, Mich., remonstrating against the repeal of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution or the repeal or modification of the national prohibition law, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH presented resolutions adopted by the council of the Medical and Chirurgical Faculty of the State of Maryland, protesting against the expenditure of funds for hospitalization in Government hospitals of veterans with non-service-connected disabilities, and favoring a discontinuance of such service for non-service-connected disabilities throughout the Nation, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of members of the Senior Woman's Missionary Society, Methodist Episcopal Church, of Frostburg, Md., praying for the passage of legislation to regulate the motion-picture industry, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. COPELAND presented resolutions adopted by members of William Clinton Story Post, No. 342, the American Legion, Freeport, N. Y., favoring the making of appropriations to continue the citizens' military camps, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a resolution adopted by members of subdistrict 15-B, Dairymen's League Cooperative Association, of Wyoming County, N. Y., favoring the passage of legislation to revalue the dollar so as to make it conform more nearly with the average commodity price level prevailing between the years of 1924 and 1929, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Interlaken, N. Y., favoring the passage of legislation to regulate trucks and busses operating as common carriers in the same manner as railroads are regulated, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Wichita, Kans., praying for the adoption of the so-called stop-alien-representation amendment to the Constitution, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of a committee representing a mass meeting of citizens of Enterprise; members of the congregation of the Seventh Day Adventist Church, and sundry citizens of Kansas City, all in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the repeal of the eighteenth amendment of the Constitution or the repeal or modification of the national prohibition law, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the petition of the Kansas Avenue Woman's Home Missionary Society, of Topeka, Kans., praying for the prompt ratification of the World Court protocols, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of the Kansas Avenue Methodist Episcopal Auxiliary of the Woman's Home Missionary Society, of Topeka, Kans., praying for the passage of legislation to regulate the motion-picture industry, which was ordered to lie on the table.

ALLOWANCES AND COMPENSATION TO VETERANS

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana presented a resolution adopted by Lewis Monroe Post, No. 53, the American Legion, and Harry E. Mead Post, No. 1421, Veterans of Foreign Wars, of Elwood, Ind., which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELWOOD, IND., January 10, 1933.

Whereas the United States Chamber of Congress and the National Economy League have heretofore and are now spreading propaganda against the patriots who bore arms in defense of our United States; and

Whereas these two organizations are sponsoring the slashing of pension payments of Spanish American war veterans, their widows and orphans; and

Whereas the two organizations are desirous of separating the classes from the masses in a proposed cut in appropriations for World War soldiers, their widows and orphans; and

Whereas no provision is made as to retired officers by reductions in their pay: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That Lewis Monroe Post, No. 53, American Legion, and Harry E. Mead Post, No. 1421, Veterans of Foreign Wars, go on record as opposed to the passage of any bill in present session of this Congress assembled looking toward the reduction of payment of pensions, compensation, or disability allowances of the veterans of any wars; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Hon. ARTHUR R. ROBINSON and Hon. JAMES E. WATSON, of the United States Senate, and to Hon. WILLIAM H. LARRABEE, of the House of Representatives.

HARRY E. MEAD, POST 1421, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS.
GILBERT WILBURN, Commander.
FRED STAFFORD, Judge Advocate.
LEWIS MONROE, POST NO. 53, THE AMERICAN LEGION.
ROBERT HARRIS, Commander.
S. L. SIGWARD, Adjutant.

ISSUANCE OF CURRENCY TO MUNICIPALITIES

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana also presented resolutions adopted by the common council of the city of Elkhart, Ind., which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution adopted by the common council of the city of Elkhart, Ind., advocating the issue of national currency to municipalities on the pledge of their bonds

Whereas national currency is issued to banks because of their special privilege on the pledge largely of municipal interest-bearing bonds purchased by such banks; and

Whereas the overwhelming interest burden of American municipalities is thus suffered for the benefit of specially privileged banking interests; and

Whereas the same security would exist for such currency if municipalities were themselves to deposit their bonds and receive the money loaned thereon for their public improvements directly from the Government of the United States of America; and

Whereas the interest on the municipally owned bonds so pledged would revert to the borrowing municipality: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is a folly and a waste to burden the public works of the people with the unnecessary debt of interest for the benefit of the privileged manipulators of the people's currency; and be it further

Resolved, That the constitutional power of Congress to coin money should be exercised directly for the benefit of the people in their public works; that suitable legislation should be enacted establishing a standard of integrity and sound economy of municipal bond issues and giving to municipalities which meet such standard the same rights enjoyed by national banks to receive national currency on the pledge of their bonds; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the

United States of America as a memorial to Congress from our city; and be it further

Resolved, That other American municipalities be, and they hereby are, invited to join in this appeal to Congress.

REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS AND SURVEYS

Mr. NYE, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, to which was referred the bill (S. 5274) to regulate service of contest notices in all cases affecting mining locations or claims, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1060) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 5259) to provide for agricultural entry of lands withdrawn, classified, or reported as containing any of the minerals subject to disposition under the general leasing law or acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1061) thereon.

Mr. CAREY, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 3831. An act for the relief of William A. Lester (Rept. No. 1062); and

S. 3832. An act for the relief of Zetta Lester (Rept. No. 1063).

SURVEY OF INDIAN CONDITIONS

Mr. FRAZIER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, submitted a partial report (pursuant to S. Res. 79, 70th Cong., and subsequent resolutions) on the system of appropriations, including Budget estimates and accounting, for expenditures in the Indian Service, on uses of tribal funds of Indians, and on accounting for individual Indian moneys held in trust, which was ordered to be printed as Part 5 of Report No. 25.

LABOR CONDITIONS UPON THE MISSISSIPPI FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECT

Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 300) authorizing an investigation of labor conditions prevailing upon the Mississippi flood-control project, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1064) thereon; and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 5409) granting an increase of pension to Lena Bradshaw (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEIWER:

A bill (S. 5410) granting an increase of pension to Blanche C. Hurd (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 5411) to require the purchase of domestic supplies for public use and the use of domestic materials in public buildings and works; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. SMOOT (by request):

A bill (S. 5412) authorizing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to associations organized for the barter of goods and services; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HOWELL:

A bill (S. 5413) for the relief of the Booth Fisheries Co. (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5414) for the relief of Robert J. Enochs (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HEBERT:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 232) authorizing an appropriation to enable the United States to send an educational exhibit and for the expenses of official delegates to the Fifth

World's Poultry Congress to be held at Rome, Italy, September 6-15, 1933; and

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 233) authorizing and requesting the President to extend an invitation to foreign governments to be represented by delegates at the Sixth World's Poultry Congress to be held in the United States in 1936, and to participate in the educational and live-bird exhibits of the Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ACTS OF THE PUERTO RICAN LEGISLATURE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying documents, referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 23 of the act of Congress approved March 2, 1917, entitled "An act to provide a civil government for Puerto Rico, and for other purposes," I transmit herewith certified copies of each of five acts and one joint resolution enacted by the Twelfth Puerto Rican Legislature during its fifth special session, from November 11 to 16, 1932.

HERBERT HOOVER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 14, 1933.

PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE—PRESIDENT'S VETO MESSAGE

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I move that the Chair lay before the Senate the veto message of the President on the Philippine independence bill.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I desire to submit a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GLASS. Will the proposed motion relative to the Philippine bill displace the special order or deprive me of my right to the floor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will not. It is a privileged matter. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arkansas.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives on the bill and message, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES, January 13, 1933.

The House of Representatives having proceeded, in pursuance of the Constitution, to reconsider the bill (H. R. 7233) to enable the people of the Philippine Islands to adopt a constitution and form a government for the Philippine Islands, to provide for the independence of the same, and for other purposes, returned by the President of the United States, with his objections, to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, it was

Resolved, That the said bill pass, two-thirds of the House of Representatives agreeing to pass the same.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The message of the President will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the President's message.

(For veto message of the President to the House of Representatives see yesterday's proceedings of the House, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. 1759-1761.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, from the day, more than 30 years ago, when the thunder of Dewey's guns at Manila announced to the world that the Spanish fleet was sinking to the bottom of the sea without raising a white flag or asking for quarter, the United States has been the trustee of the Philippine Islands.

Throughout all the time that has elapsed since our Government first took possession there it has been accepted by all political parties in the United States that we should, as soon as practicable and just, recognize and grant the independence of the people of the Philippine Islands.

Almost every platform that has been adopted by the Democratic Party since the occupation of the Philippines by our troops has expressly declared for independence.

Those who sit on the other side of the Chamber have never opposed the principle or the proposal that in the course of time, when conditions permitted and justified it, we should grant separate nationality to these people.

With the passing of the years and the acquisition by Americans of interests and properties in the Philippines, the problem has grown more and more complicated from a practical viewpoint; and I think nearly all Senators would agree that this condition will be manifest until it becomes apparent that the United States is going to keep faith with itself, with its people, with the people of the world, and especially with the people of the Philippine Islands, and recognize their independence.

There never will be a more opportune time for determining this question than the present hour. There never will exist fewer or less powerful influences that seek to promote the accomplishment of selfish ends by the retention of these islands as possessions of the United States than now exist.

We are met for the purpose of determining the very important issue whether the bill passed by an overwhelming majority of both Houses of the Congress, after prolonged study on the part of their respective committees, shall be enacted notwithstanding the veto of the Executive.

It will be recalled that when the measure was before the Senate of the United States it was discussed at great length. I point out now to Senators that every objection raised by the President in his veto message was the subject matter of discussion before the Senate committee and in the Senate, not only during the present session, when the bill was passed, but also during the last session, when many days were devoted to its consideration.

There is not a single objection raised by the President in this veto message that was not deliberated upon by the committee and by the Senate. It follows, Mr. President, if this veto should be sustained and the vexing question of the relation of the Philippine Islands and people to the United States be perpetuated in American politics, that the same issues will again rise to vex and perplex us. We shall have to discuss them again and decide them; and it is my judgment that the action of the Senate, and for that matter of the body at the other end of the Capitol, would differ in no material particular from the action which they took when, in the exercise of their constitutional authority, they passed this bill redeeming the pledges of the political parties that dominate this Nation, and sustaining the honor of our Government and the glory of our flag.

To examine for just a few moments some of the details of the objections asserted by the President, some of the statements contained in the message throwing light on the very forceful arguments which he presented in vindication of his position, let it be pointed out that what he really says in the first sentence is that the people of the Philippine Islands do not need any more liberty or independence than they now have. The language, substantially, is that the Filipinos already have as much liberty and freedom as any people in the world.

Anyone taking that view of the subject would, of course, be disposed to acquiesce in the conclusion of the President; but, in my judgment, that is inconsistent with the real grounds upon which the veto is rested. In a sentence immediately following that to which I have referred is found the statement that the Filipinos are lacking in separate nationality, and that this is a mere matter of form. This is the position taken by conquerors in every age of recorded history. There never has been a conqueror within my knowledge who has not justified the measured tread and advance of his armies on the ground that the dominion of his forces was essential to the liberty and enlightenment of the peoples passing under his flag.

Separate nationality is the essence of liberty and freedom. Governments in the United States change from year to year; administrations change every four years; and policies are altered with the change of administrations.

I am vain enough to believe that the administration of the affairs of the Philippine Islands under our flag and under the various administrations which have come into power and

passed from power since 1898 has been liberal and generous. But always there has been the hand of power upon the people. Always there has been supreme authority in my country in contradistinction to the people of the Philippine Islands.

Mark it, if you please, the right of self-determination, the opportunity for a people to determine for themselves what political institutions they shall maintain—in that privilege and opportunity rests real liberty, real freedom.

The President says that the Filipinos have been encouraged by every President of the United States to seek independence. I do not know what the President himself has done in that particular. I do not know what his predecessor did, or what President Harding did, to encourage the Filipinos in their aspirations for independence. But I do know that there has never been a political organization in the United States that has had the audacity to raise the black flag of the conqueror and assert the right of the United States to maintain unlimited and endless control over these people for the benefit of the people of the United States.

The justification for perpetuating our control is found in the implication that the Filipinos are not capacitated to govern themselves; that if we pull down our flag and withdraw our Army and our Navy, they will experience insurrection and be attacked by outside forces. The conclusion of the matter is that the fear of the President is that the Filipinos are not capable of self-government.

The agitation in the islands has continued throughout the 35 years that we have been there. We have expended enormous funds and contributed liberally to the advancement of the people and to the promotion of what we conceive to be our best interests, but there has not been a day when the Philippine leaders have not been asking for independence. That is the thing they believe their people desire; that is the thing for which they speak. For 35 years the agitation has been going on.

Delay has been justified on the ground that it is necessary to prepare them for independence. The question is whether the time has come to redeem our pledges, or whether we should defer action for 15 or 20 years, as the President insists in his veto message.

He justifies his rejection of the measure on the ground that it would result in probable economic disaster or injury to the Philippines. In his veto message he asserts that no man can tell what will happen within the next two decades, which, of course, is true. None of us is endowed with the gift of prophecy. It may be entirely true that Philippine business will not prosper after independence is extended. But, after all, that is not the controlling consideration. One would rather be free and have the right to walk at liberty in God's clear light, and enjoy a limited measure of the comforts of life, than be indulged in luxury behind prison bars; and if the spirit of liberty is deep in the breasts of the people, if they long and seek for self-expression, mere subsidies from foreign governments will not deprive them of their aspirations, will not induce them to withdraw from their position.

The statement is made, and it was urged ably and forcefully by the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] when the bill was before the Senate, that one of the vital objections to the measure is that it would diminish the power and authority of the United States during the intermediate period before final independence. That is exactly what has been done from time to time since we took possession of the islands. Our policy has been to give gradually to those people more and more power and self-control, more and more opportunity for self-expression, and the experiment has worked very well. No man can say that within the next two decades there may not come domestic trouble in the Philippine Islands. No man can say that regarding the United States.

There is no place on this round earth with which I am familiar where political authority is so entrenched, so fortified, that it may not be questioned or assailed, and it seems, from the study I have been able to make of the matter, that political security in the Philippines is just about as great

as it is in any other place. I refer now to domestic troubles, to possible insurrections.

The President also says that there is the danger of attack from external forces. He declares that to accept the terms of the bill would invite an assault on the Philippines by some foreign power, notwithstanding we assert in the bill the policy of securing a treaty of neutralization for the people of the islands.

Does the President mean that foreign powers would take advantage of our fairness, our redemption of our pledges, to pursue an aggressive military policy in the Philippine Islands? In 1921, during President Harding's administration, so confident were we that that could never occur, that we signed and ratified a solemn treaty relinquishing our right further to fortify the Philippine Islands, and putting those islands at the mercy, while under our flag, of any oriental foe that might be so unwise and so audacious as to assail us.

There is not a naval or a military strategist in the United States who will state now that if the Philippines were assailed by a powerful foe from land and sea our strength there would be sufficient to maintain the defenses. Let no one who hears me imagine that any power that looks with envy on the territory of the Philippines is not as fully apprised as we are of that fact. So that the danger of external attack if there be one, exists now.

I do not believe that such danger exists in fact. Nor can one conceive of the possibility, much less the probability, of an enemy fleet attempting to take the territory of the Philippines and work their purpose there.

The statement is made in the message that even though the islands are neutralized consistently with the policy of the bill, that will give them no real protection, which implies a total lack of confidence in treaties and the good faith of nations which make them. Since there is no assurance that 15 or 20 years hence conditions would be changed materially from those which now exist, the whole weight of the President's argument is in favor of continuing to hold out a hope not realized for 35 years, the hope of independence of the people and of denying the grant of independence on the ground that it is necessary to do so for their protection.

We abandoned the right to further fortify the Philippines in the treaty of 1921. Our present fortifications are not strong enough, admittedly, to resist the attack of possible foes. So that as I view it, this suggestion of the danger of an external attack is an attempt, a subconscious attempt, at least, to arouse the fires and the spirit of patriotism on the part of the people of the United States, and put into us the fighting spirit that would prompt us to yield nothing and insist on keeping everything.

Moreover, the complete answer to that suggestion is that the bill contemplates the retention of military and naval bases adequate for the requirements of the Government, so that the position in the matter referred to would not be materially different under the bill from that which exists prior to the passage of the measure.

Another feature of the President's message to which attention is invited is his complaint about too early a plebiscite. He finds, apparently, that there is something very wrong, almost sinful in a political sense, in permitting a vote within two or three years, and insists that it ought not to come for 15 or 20 years. Of course, the mere indefiniteness of his own statement tends to show the inaccuracy of his conclusion. Fifteen or twenty years? Why not say 25 or 30 years, 35 or 40 years, or 10 or 15 years to get right back to the language of the bill?

Mr. President, every argument in the message against the passage and effectiveness of the bill has already been considered by the Senate. I never heard in this body a more able or more forceful presentation of a cause than was made by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] when he insisted that so long as the United States flag flies in the Philippines we ought to retain complete and almost unlimited control there. I think he presented every argument that exists to sustain his contention, and I am sure that he presented those arguments more forcefully than

anyone will ever do again in the Senate of the United States. We passed upon the question. We decided against his contention, and now the President comes back raising the issue anew.

There are, of course, many things that may be said on both sides of the proposition, but this may be said on the side of the right of the bill. For all time to come, within a very short period these people, whom we have known so intimately, whom we think we have served so kindly, are to go their way along the highways of world progress, unguided and uncontrolled by ourselves. The theory of the bill is that following their adoption of a constitution and the announcement of their purpose to accept the terms of independence contemplated by the bill they will enjoy a measure of self-control, of self-government, if you please, larger and more liberal than that extended to them now, but for a definite time we will attempt to assist; we will remain with a measure of authority, however limited it may be.

Oh, the President says, some of the provisions in the bill are unjust to the Filipinos and by implication some of them are unjust to the people of the United States. Mr. President, I said in the beginning that with the passing of the years those economic troubles at issue will become more and more complex, and that now is the best time to settle them. I believe that the bill works out those issues in as fair a manner, extending as it does to our own people as much opportunity as is consistent with our duties as trustees and to the people of the Philippine Islands, as many concessions as we would probably be able to make if we took the whole matter back and undertook to write a new bill. The simple truth is that the President's view of the question is influenced and controlled in all probability by the opinion of the Secretary of War.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. On the point just mentioned by the Senator I would like to get his opinion as to the probability of this legislation or similar legislation receiving early consideration in case the bill fails of passage at this session.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I have been asked often to enter into the realm of prophecy. As the Senator well knows, there are many difficult questions before the Senate and before the House of Representatives, some of them of relatively greater acuteness and, I might say, importance so far as the people of the United States are concerned. I would not like to venture an opinion as to what will happen in the future. The weight of my argument, if it has weight, is that now is the accepted time. For 30 years we have been talking and promising. We have given to these people the best consideration that some of the best minds in both Houses of Congress were capable of giving, and now to yield to what we knew or had ground to know was the opinion of the Executive when he stated his opposition to the legislation would be an act of futility and impotency in which I trust the Senate will not indulge.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, as chairman of the committee which prepared and reported the bill and as one of the conferees who put it in its final form, I have a few brief remarks to make in regard to the question now before the Senate.

The President has sent us a long and powerful message. He has summed up ably and with forceful language the arguments against the bill. As the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] has stated, however, there is nothing new in the message in the way of argument or statement of fact. The committee for some years has had long hearings on the question of Philippine independence. A corresponding committee of the House of Representatives has had prolonged hearings. The chairman of that committee, a Representative from the State of South Carolina, visited the Philippines not very long ago in an effort to study the situation at first hand. The senior author of the bill

before us, the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. HAWES], made a prolonged stay in the islands and a study of the situation before the bill was put in final form.

The committee took evidence in extenso. Everyone desiring to be heard appeared. From the Secretary of State and the Secretary of War the committee received the views of the administration and its objections to the granting of independence at the present time. My own visit to the Philippines in 1927 led me to believe that it would be wiser if we put off the day of independence long enough to permit the Filipinos to borrow money and see the bonds amortized. I should like to have seen the bill passed definitely granting independence at the end of 25 or 30 years. However, my views did not meet with any response on the part of the committee. It was felt that was by far too long a time. On the other hand, it is well known that the people of the Philippine Islands have for years desired immediate independence. It was my belief that immediate independence would be disastrous to them, however much they might be willing to face the serious economic circumstances of immediate independence.

After hearing testimony from all sides the committee proceeded to make a very thorough study of what would constitute the best possible bill. In the case of no committee with which I have been connected in the eight years I have been here has there been more thorough study, more nonpartisan study, on the part of both sides of the table in the study of any great question or any great bill before a committee.

The bill as it came out of the committee represented a compromise between the views of those who desire immediate independence and of those who desire independence in the distant future. The bill as it came out of conference and passed both Houses of Congress represented a compromise between those who would like to see us get out of the Philippines at once, "bag and baggage," and put them in the position of a foreign country, and those who believe we should maintain a foothold for our Army and Navy in the Far East in order that we might be ready at a moment's notice to quell riots or disturbances on the mainland of China due to revolutionary conditions in that country; that we might maintain our prestige by seeing our flag fly still over the fortress at Corregidor, the great naval base at Cavite, the floating dry-dock which we took out there some years ago, the military stations in Mindanao, and other reservations made in the interest of protecting our name and our rights and our position and dignity in the Far East.

Frankly, if it had not been that the conferees were willing to insert in the bill a provision that military and naval stations erected at great cost by the United States and paid for, not only by our treasure but by the blood of our soldiers, should not be surrendered but should be retained, I should have fought the bill as long as there was any power in me to fight it on the floor of the Senate. But that situation has been protected. Our interests in the Far East have been protected. As the Senator from Arkansas so very forcefully said, if anyone wants to take the Philippine Islands at the present time, if any Asiatic power should desire to take them, it is the opinion of our military and naval men that they could do so and that we would have an extremely difficult, costly, and prolonged war before we could possibly get them back, if we did so.

We are prevented from increasing our fortifications at the present time. If anyone wants to go in and seize these islands they can do so, and we would have to go to war to defend them. If the bill passes, the veto of the President to the contrary notwithstanding, and a treaty of neutralization is entered into as is requested by the Congress, we shall be in a far stronger position than before, because then the rights of those people to live a peaceable life without interference from foreign countries will have not only the backing of the United States but of any other nation that may sign such a treaty of neutrality.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I dislike to interrupt the Senator at this point, because I think I am in sympathy with the position he expects to take ultimately on the veto message; but I am wondering if, so far as defending our interests out there may be concerned, we would not be better off under all the circumstances if we retained no bases there, because under the Washington conference and the treaty of 1921-22 we surrendered all right to fortify anything in the Far East. It would be just as difficult, it seems to me, to defend the bases and stations that we may retain out there as it would be to defend the islands themselves.

Mr. BINGHAM. I appreciate the position taken by the Senator. I do not believe, however, that as long as we maintain our military and naval stations out there we will be confronted with the danger of a war. The great advantage of our stations out there is to our people residing in China. Missionaries, business men, students, and others who live in China at the present time have to look to the United States for protection in case of riot, revolution, and the constant civil war that appears to be going on in that country, without any end in sight. To push our cruisers and our marines several thousand miles farther east would make it much more difficult for them to reach the Chinese ports than at the present time, when in the course of 48 hours they can reach the most important ports in China. I can not but remember from my visit to China in 1927, when there were riots a thousand miles up on the Yangtze near the port of Hankow, that as soon as one of our cruisers arrived off that port there were no more riots in which foreigners lost their lives. The very presence of that cruiser in those waters acted as a pacifying influence. It is for the reason, not of carrying on war, but of maintaining a close base to China and maintaining there our dignity and the dignity of our flag that I am in favor of the position taken in the bill.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the worst thing that could happen to the Philippine Islands would be to have a continuation of uncertainty for an unlimited period. At the present time no one wants to invest money in the Philippine Islands because he does not know what the nature of the government there will be within three or four years. To postpone a decision with regard to independence, as the President suggests, for some 20 years and then leave it to a plebiscite would be to prolong the period of uncertainty by 15 or 20 years and make it extremely difficult for any industry to get started, for, in the nature of things, that requires a definite and certain future.

I had hoped that we might have a better bill; but, Mr. President, as every student of government knows, legislation, whether it be of a village or a town or the National Government, is largely a matter of compromise. I note among the names of those who voted to sustain the veto in the body at the other end of the Capitol the name of one who has publicly announced his determination to secure immediate independence and has been fighting for it for a long time. I submit, Mr. President, that to grant immediate independence would cause far more suffering, far greater disruption of our international relations and of economic conditions in the Philippine Islands than the bill to which the President objects.

The President in his veto message says:

Immigration should be restricted at once.

That question has been repeatedly debated on the floors of both Houses of Congress. It ought to be known by the Executive that, in the opinion of the great majority of the Members of Congress, so long as our flag flies over a colony or a distant possession there should be some measure of intercourse, and that while granting no form of independence at all, and making no promise of any, to restrict immigration immediately, while it would suit certain people in this country, does not appear to have any likelihood whatsoever of passing the Congress.

Mr. SHORTTRIDGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. SHORTTRIDGE. The Senator will recall that I introduced and there is pending a bill to stop Filipino immigration to continental United States. With great respect to the views of the learned Senator, I have taken the position, and I hold it now, that there would not be any inconsistency or violation of principles if we did stop immigration whilst our flag floated over the Philippine Islands.

I note the remarks of the President in his message, and I was curious as to whether the President thought, as I have thought, that we could without violating principle stop completely Filipino immigration into continental United States pending the transition period contemplated by the bill.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, under the bill as it passed both Houses and came out of conference it would not go into effect until the Filipino Legislature had accepted its provisions and ordered a plebiscite, and not until then would the immigration provisions go into effect. In other words, those provisions are placed upon themselves by the Filipinos and by their government, and I do not believe there is any likelihood whatsoever that the Congress would pass a restriction of Filipino immigration until they themselves had taken some such action as is contemplated in the bill.

Mr. President, as I have said, the worst that could happen to the Philippines would be a continuation of a period of uncertainty. There is no likelihood whatsoever that the Congress, in its present mood and the mood which we have seen pervade the United States during the last three or four years, would pass a bill which would permit this whole matter to be settled 15 or 20 years from now. We are facing a fact and not a theory. Theoretically what the President suggests might be the better thing to do, but actually it is outside the bounds of possibility.

Therefore, Mr. President, since there is no new matter in the President's message, since there are no arguments that the committees of Congress have not heretofore heard and with which they have not been familiar, since no new disclosures have been made and nothing has been suggested as an oversight in the consideration of the bill by the committees or by the Congress, it seems to me that it is my duty to go along with the committee which, after months of study and careful preparation framed this bill and finally secured its passage.

The President's veto message makes criticism of the bill on the ground that the new high commissioner has, to quote his language, only "certain inconsequential powers." As a matter of fact, Mr. President, that reference might also be applied to any ambassador, for an ambassador has no power except that he represents the President. His powers are certainly "inconsequential," and yet he is a person of great distinction, recognized in international law. Therefore, the high commissioner of the Philippines would not be an inconsequential person, he would be there representing the President in his right to veto any legislation which was of a particularly vicious character, as mentioned in the bill.

The President calls the attention of Congress and of the country to the question of export levies and says that—

The intermediate government is to levy export taxes, to increase from an initial charge of 5 per cent in the sixth year of that government to 25 per cent in the tenth year.

Mr. President, any citizen of the United States not familiar with the bill and reading that statement would suppose that the export duties were to be 25 per cent of the value of the sugar or other articles sent to the United States at the end of the tenth year. That, however, is not a correct statement. The export duties are to be 25 per cent of the present tariff rate on sugar, starting with 5 per cent of that rate. Therefore the statement is misleading.

A little farther on the veto message calls attention to the fact that industries in the Philippines "can not compete with the lower standards of living and costs in other tropical and subtropical countries, except by virtue of their favored entrance to our markets."

That fact is well known, Mr. President, and that condition will not change at the end of 25 or even 50 years. We have

set up a high standard of living there; we have given their products free entry to this country; their economic prosperity depends upon it; but we believe that they understand something of that in demanding independence; and when we grant them independence, we know and they know that they will have to pay what any other foreign country has to pay in exporting their goods to the United States. It will be true then, even under the bill as suggested by the President, as it is true under this bill that—

Lands now employed in these products must be abandoned or alternatively all real wages and standards of living and all land values must be reduced to the level of other competing countries.

There is nothing new in that statement. We all knew that to be so; it was called repeatedly to the attention of the committees and of the Congress.

The President goes on in another part of the message to call attention to the fact that, from an agricultural point of view, the bill gives no protection of any kind for two years. The suggestion made by the President that there be no change for 15 or 20 years would not give any protection either, except that he suggests a gradual increasing of the tariff wall. But he says:

During the following five years it gives no effective protection because the amount of competitive commodities admitted into the United States duty free is in sugar 50 per cent larger than that of 1928.

Well, Mr. President, the year 1928 was some time ago. Actually, complaint was brought by the Filipinos against this bill that the amount of duty-free sugar coming into the United States under this bill is less than it will be this year and much less than it will be next year. It seems to me that the Executive ought to have been a little more frank in this statement and not have attempted to mislead the people of the United States into thinking that the Congress is so foolish as to have passed a bill that admits 50 per cent more sugar than is admitted at the present time.

A little further along, the President states that:

The income of the Philippine government has never in the past been sufficient to meet, in addition to other expenditures, the cost of supporting even the Filipino Scouts, much less an army or navy.

Mr. President, I venture to say that there are very few within the sound of my voice who know what is meant by the term "Filipino Scouts." I venture to say that the implication in that sentence is that the Filipino Scouts are not a part of the Army but are something in the nature of the Texas Rangers or the Pennsylvania constabulary. As a matter of fact, the term "Filipino Scouts" is applied to regiments in the United States Army composed of Filipino personnel. If the President means that the Philippine government does not support the cost of the Filipino constabulary, then he is incorrect, for the cost of the Filipino constabulary is maintained by the Philippine government. There is in the Philippine Islands a very able organization—the constabulary—something like the Mounted Police of Canada, maintained at the cost of the Philippine government itself, designed to preserve order and discipline. The Philippine Scouts are not called out for that purpose except in time of riot or in great necessity, as happens in the United States when a part of the Army is called out. Therefore, the implication that the Philippine government can not support even the Filipino Scouts, much less an army or navy is not a frank statement of the case. It leads us to believe that the President is not aware of the situation regarding the Philippine constabulary, for the name "Filipino Scouts" merely applies to regiments in the United States Army and does not include the constabulary.

A little further on, Mr. President, the President complains because the bill contains "evasions." He says:

Nor can these conditions be solved by the evasions . . . of this bill without national dishonor.

I am sure that many newspaper editors reading that phrase will be ready to castigate the Congress if it passes this bill over the President's veto. It is a difficult bill to understand. It has been drawn with great care; but what are the

"evasions" to which the President refers? He does not state specifically, but in the sentence at the beginning of the paragraph there is the implication that we do not decide whether we have any further national stake in the islands. That is true. We leave that to the Filipinos themselves to decide by the plebiscite. There is the implication that if the Filipino people are now prepared for self-government we ought to say so. Mr. President, we virtually say so by giving them a chance to form their own constitution and to adopt it.

There is no evasion there. There is the implication that if they can maintain order and their institutions, we should say so frankly. If we have not said so by permitting them to set up a government of their own and to carry it on with very slight guidance from us, then I do not understand the language of the bill, and I do not believe that the President fully understands what the bill means.

He then states:

If they can now defend their independence, we should say so frankly on both sides.

There is no question that the Philippine Islands have not the money to set up a large army and navy and defend their independence. That is the reason why the provision for a treaty of neutrality was placed in the bill. There is no evasion in that. The only evasions in the bill are that the bill does not become a law until it is acted upon by the Philippine Legislature and that independence is not sure until the Filipino people themselves vote in their plebiscite that they want independence and are willing to accept the constitution which their constitutional convention has drafted for them.

It does not seem to me that these charges of evasion or of national dishonor are fair to the Congress, are fair to those who have spent long periods of time studying and trying to draft a bill which shall meet the needs of the Filipino people, the needs of our own people, the demands made as a result of the frequent promises for independence, the evidence that the Philippine government is able to carry on its political activities in an orderly and decent manner and has so conducted it, the evidence that more than a million people take part in the elections in the Philippine Islands.

It is quite true, as was stated on the floor, that independence is going to bring economic disaster to the Philippine Islands; but they know that, and they will have a chance to learn it even more during the next two years. If, in the face of that, they wish to assume the burdens of independence, then they are privileged to do so.

It seems to me that the closing sentence in the message is most unfair. The President states:

This legislation puts both our people and the Philippine people not on the road to liberty and safety, which we desire, but on the path leading to new and enlarged dangers to liberty and freedom itself.

From our study of the bill, from all the evidence we were able to secure, from a clear understanding of the desires of a majority of the representatives of the American people in Congress, it is my belief that that sentence is not justified; that we have before us the best possible bill, representing a compromise between the extremes, that can be drafted and passed by the Congress. I do not believe that anyone on this floor would venture to express the belief that a bill could be passed putting this whole thing forward 15 or 20 years and leaving us in a period of uncertainty all that time. Therefore, since this is the best bill that we can get, since it has not been drawn in haste but with care, since it has been drafted by committees that have visited the islands, that have studied the situation carefully and heard all sides, I hope that the Senate will by a two-thirds vote override the veto, because I fear that if that is not done, selfish interests and others desirous of securing more immediate independence will have their way, and we may see the passage of a bill which we might all regret if it brought unnecessary suffering and hardship in too short a period of time.

I know that the original authors of the bill believed that we should have a far shorter period of time. The House passed a bill calling for independence in eight years. The Senate placed it at something like 12 years. We compro-

mised on 10 years. It is possible the compromise was not long enough, but it was the best we could secure; and anything in the future is likely to be along the lines of greater hardship to the Philippine people, to the Americans who have invested their lives and their fortunes in those islands, and to our own standing in the Far East.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall vote against the veto and to sustain the action of the Congress.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, although I do not concur in every detail of the argument submitted by the President of the United States respecting the general Philippine problem, I find myself in complete and emphatic concurrence with the fundamental objections which he submits to this particular measure in his pending veto message—a message worthy of the finest traditions of the White House.

The Senate is familiar with the fact that ordinarily I am delighted to submit to interruptions and to encourage the broadest colloquy in debate. At the present moment, for the sake of the conservation of time and the continuity of argument, I shall ask to proceed without interruption.

Mr. President, I do not dissent from a single utterance of the able and distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] in respect to the obligations of America regarding the Filipino people. I think I have made my attitude upon that score utterly clear in the past. I intend to make it even more clear in the future. That abstract question, however, as so eloquently addressed by the Democratic leader, is beside the immediate point which challenges the conscience and the responsibility of the Senate. The problem which confronts the Senate—the last and final forum in which the test and answer shall be made—is whether or not this particular formula is an adequate, a rational, a decent, a legitimate, a safe response to these aspirations for Philippine independence which the Senator from Arkansas so ably depicted and to which America is irrevocably committed.

I want to say at the very outset, Mr. President, that I do not think there is a line in the President's message which is at war with these aspirations. I do not conceive that we who shall vote to sustain this veto are in any degree less wedded to the ultimate effectual independence of the Philippine Islands than are those who urge the passage of the present hybrid measure. On the contrary, the very prelude to the President's message, the very text to which he addresses himself, is a pregnant sentence respecting the Filipinos and their independence, reading as follows:

They—

The Filipinos—

have been encouraged in this aspiration—

Namely, independence—

by every President of the United States during the years of our association with the Philippines and by declarations of the Congress.

I find no dissent in the presidential message to this fundamental principle. There is no dissent so far as my defense of the presidential message is concerned. On the contrary, I have repeatedly said upon this floor that we are under absolute obligation to give the Philippine Islands their effectual independence under the terms of the preamble of the Jones Act of 1916, if and when we are satisfied that our obligation is honorably liquidated, and that their opportunity to survive is reasonably apparent. I do not desert that principle for one moment in supporting this veto message, nor do I admit for one moment that there is jot or tittle in the message itself which deserts these aspirations and this objective. A vote to sustain this veto does not violate the realities of this pledge.

Mr. President, the only thing I want to do in a few brief moments this afternoon is to ask the Senate to look these realities in the face precisely as the Chief Executive has done, and not to decide a practical question purely upon an emotional appeal.

If an emotional appeal alone shall be urged in the situation, I could make an infinitely stronger emotional appeal

that the liquidation of American responsibilities in the Philippine Islands shall not be determined on the basis of what the particular best advantage of our own American people may be in their economic selfishness; but I am proposing solely to ask a consultation of the realities. I am saying again at the outset that we can consult the realities in respect to the President's message, we can agree with its conclusion in respect to these realities, and continue to be even better friends to the honor of America in respect to the Philippines, even more reliable friends to American security in respect to our obligations in the Far East, and better friends even to American agriculture and labor than by undertaking to proceed along the doubtful formula in the pending bill which the Executive cogently repudiates.

The President's message says—the able Senator from Arkansas emphasized it:

The Philippine people have to-day as great a substance of ordered liberty and human freedom as any people in the world.

That is correct. They have 98 per cent of electoral autonomy. They have more freedom in some aspects than do the citizens of a State in the United States. This is no reason why we should deny the ultimate obligation to which the Senator from Arkansas referred; but, Mr. President, it is an everlasting reason why we are not called upon to feel that this decision must be taken in the face of an adverse record of unfair or undemocratic dealings with the Filipinos upon that score, because there is no adverse record. We have dealt already with the Philippine Islands upon a basis and principle which absolutely validates the prospectus of their freedom and their independence.

There is nothing in this message, if it be sustained, which interrupts the realities of the best welfare of Philippine independence, as I think I can prove.

Mr. President, the message submitted to this body upon the responsibility of the Chief Executive of the United States probably does not present any new argumentative material which has not been previously canvassed in the debates in the Senate. The Senator from Arkansas is probably right when he says that the message reads in paraphrase of the debates in this Chamber, and particularly in paraphrase of my own speeches to the Senate upon this problem. He does me the very gracious compliment to say that the paraphrase is no improvement upon the original production; but, Mr. President, the paraphrase, if it be a paraphrase—which I admit only for the sake of the argument—has behind it something which was not behind the original presentation. It has behind it the solemn responsibility of the President of the United States.

When under such auspices and upon such high responsibility we are recalled to confront these arguments, even though it be a mere repetition of the arguments, I submit that we are called indeed to contemplate them with an exceedingly solemn sense of obligation to our oaths.

This message from which the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Connecticut have dissented so eloquently sets up a rule of three fundamental responsibilities which the Senate can not ignore when it studies and answers this question. I want to canvass those three responsibilities.

The first responsibility is this—I am quoting from the President:

Our responsibility to the Philippine people is that in finding a method by which we consummate their aspiration we do not project them into economic and social chaos with the probability of breakdown in government, with its consequences in degeneration of a rising liberty which has been so carefully nurtured by the United States at the cost of thousands of American lives and hundreds of millions of money.

Mr. President, this is our primary responsibility as stewards and trustees for 13,000,000 people. I submit that we can not liquidate or answer our responsibility as stewards and trustees by a mere eloquent declamation respecting the joys and the glories of independence, if it be the fact that political autonomy may find itself linked with an economic disaster which will turn all these joys and glories to ashes on the lips. That would not be rendering service to the realities of independence or of our responsibility. It is mere rhetoric. Therefore, when the President recalls us to this

particular responsibility, he does not violate any of the tenets or realities of liberty and freedom. He merely asks us to see that we shall serve the substance rather than the empty shadow of these great objectives. To do less would be a travesty.

What is our second responsibility, as detailed under the presidential formula? I quote:

Our responsibility to the American people—

And, Mr. President, we have a very hazardous responsibility to the American people at this moment in the Far East.

Our responsibility to the American people is that we shall see the fact of Philippine separation accomplished without endangering ourselves in military action hereafter to maintain internal order or to protect the Philippines from encroachment by others, and, above all, that this shall be accomplished so as to avoid the very grave dangers of future controversies and seeds of war with other nations.

Mr. President, we ignore a challenge to our responsibility upon this score at our utter peril. We are not only the custodians of a trusteeship in behalf of the Philippine people; we are the custodians of the welfare, yea, and particularly the peace, of the American people. Before we commit ourselves to any adverse formula which may in any calculation involve the peace of America, we were best upon our guard to see that no malignant exposure is needlessly invited and that no error needlessly occurs.

The Senate is well familiar with my view upon this particular score. I shall advert to it briefly a moment later. I say it is the vice of this bill that we would be kept in a continuation of responsibility in the Far East without an authority commensurate to implement that responsibility. I say that if the American people were cognizant of the fact that it is proposed to leave us in the Orient under the implications of the responsibilities of a veritable Platt amendment, speaking in terms of Cuban analogy, they would have vastly less enthusiasm for the pending bill.

What is our third responsibility under the formula submitted by the President? I quote:

We have a responsibility to the world that having undertaken to develop and perfect freedom for these people we shall not by our course project more chaos into a world already sorely beset by instability. The present bill fails to fulfill these responsibilities.

I do not stress this third chapter in the bill of particulars. It can not be ignored; but Philippine and American considerations are entitled to first consultation. It is upon the basis of these first two consultations that I am rising to say respectfully to the Senate that our obligation unequivocally and without reservation requires of us that the presidential viewpoint as submitted in this message shall be sustained.

The President has submitted a general philosophy of action in respect to dealing with the Philippine Islands. He has suggested somewhat in detail how he would implement that philosophy if he had his way. He has spoken in terms of a program that should run for 15 or 20 years, with a plebiscite at the end of that period, with a constitution adopted at the end instead of at the beginning of that period, with graduated economic readjustments by way of progressive tariff rates in the course of the period, and he has said that this, in his view, is the best method for liquidating our responsibility under the obligations of the preamble of the Jones Act of 1916.

Naturally, I am prejudiced in favor of that general view, because, as the Senator from Arkansas said a short time ago, it is a view which I have repeatedly submitted myself to the Senate, and which I specifically submitted in the form of a substitute to the pending bill, a substitute which was rejected.

The President states the case admirably for this type of procedure, a procedure built upon the theory of preindependence preparation for independence, with our authority sustained to the utter end until our responsibility is relaxed.

But that suggestion of the President is obiter dictum so far as the immediate problem before the Senate is concerned. It is beside the point. We are not choosing to-day between

this scheme which the President would prefer, and the existing scheme. We are deciding to-day whether the existing scheme shall be rejected, so that the track will be clear to develop a new and better plan, whether it be the President's or something wholly different in its detail.

Mr. President, there are just two consistent methods of dealing with the problem of Philippine independence. I do not mean to be dogmatic in this statement; yet I think it can be stated with finality. One method is the method proposed in the presidential message, which is the method of a substantially long period of preindependence preparation, during which time we maintain American responsibility and authority.

The other method, and the only other logical method, is to give the Philippines their independence as speedily as possible, which could readily be within a period of two years; withdraw from the islands in respect not only to our responsibility, but also in respect to our authority; reject any jeopardy upon that subsequent score, leave the islands to their economic development under their own flag and upon their own responsibility; and then provide, subsequent to this complete act of separation, a subsequent period of postindependence economic readjustment over a period of 8 or 10 years, during which these progressive tariffs should apply.

As an evidence of my own good faith in the position I now take, Mr. President, I want to state frankly to the Senate that, although heretofore I have always embraced the first theory and although that has been the proposition which I have constantly urged in this body, inasmuch as it is perfectly clear that Congress prefers, by a substantial majority, a different course, hereafter I shall embrace the second theory, and I shall support the earliest possible complete independence for the Philippine Islands, with a post-independence period of economic adjustment.

I repeat, however, that this is beside the present point, except as it bears upon the possibility of preferable alternatives in the event that the pending veto is sustained. The present challenge to the Senate is solely and alone the question whether the theory embraced within the pending bill shall be approved, and the theory embraced within the pending bill is an attempted coalition of the ideas in both of these other two methods of procedure. It is a sort of a hybrid born of both. It is neither fish nor flesh nor fowl.

It is neither one consistent theory nor the other; and, as is inevitably the situation and the case when futile compromise efforts of this character are involved, the net result is not only utterly unsatisfactory, but it is utterly dangerous.

Mr. President, the consideration before the Senate, I repeat, is the pending formula, and the challenge to the senatorial conscience is whether the President of the United States has laid down a sufficient question mark in respect to the formula to put us on notice not hastily to carry it through. The analysis of the Chief Executive in this aspect is unanswerable. What it lacks in emotions it makes up in realities.

I do not propose to repeat the detailed argument, but I do want to emphasize again my own conception of the one controlling factor which the President of the United States urges upon the Senate as the primary reason why it is better far to reject this formula and then try again. I refer to the fact that under this pending formula—and only the Senate of the United States is left as an authority that can stop it—the American flag would be left up in the Orient, but adequate American authority to maintain the destiny of that flag in that perplexed sector of the world would be so diluted and attenuated that we would have ceased to be the captains of our own souls and the masters of our own destiny.

I want to read what the President has had to say upon this question of responsibility without authority. I do not see how any Senator of the United States can run away from the challenge that is thus laid down upon the responsibility of the highest official in the American Government. I read:

The bill weakens our civil authority during the period of intermediate government to a point of practical impotence. The powers which the high commissioner can exercise on his own initiative are unimportant, and those which can be delegated to him by the President over legislation are doubtful and indirect. During this period, however, the American flag will be flying and our Army will be in occupation. Our Government, with inadequate civil means for exercising its sovereign authority to control the situation but with continued moral responsibility to maintain stable government, will daily, during those years, be faced with the likelihood of having to employ military measures to maintain order in a degenerating social and economic situation, or, alternately, to expend large sums from our taxpayers in supporting a constantly enfeebled government.

Mr. President, that challenge to the Senate is invincibly true. The pending formula which the Executive of the Nation asks shall be rejected is a standing invitation for trouble to the American people, and, unfortunately, it is a standing invitation of a nature which may involve us in the very curtilage of war itself. We had trouble only two months ago in the southern part of the islands that took a personal visit from the Governor General, backed as he was by all the authority of the United States, to compose the situation peacefully.

Subsection (n) in the pending bill calls for our intermittent intervention. What an amazing thing it is that we should have to have a contract to intervene in the affairs of a people who are under our flag! Subsection (n) is a perpetual contract for intervention. It involves a perpetual promise and obligation to intervene, of a nature infinitely more direct and pressing than is contained in the Platt amendment in respect to the Cuban situation; and yet the obligation of ours under the Platt amendment in Cuba already has taken us back there once. I hesitate to believe the American people are willing to live under any Platt amendment in respect to the Far East which might directly or indirectly carry us against our contemporary will back into that perplexed sector of the world. Not only that, Mr. President, but the existence of this perpetual contract to intervene is in its essence a perpetual invitation to those elements in the islands which may be dissatisfied with this program to find a means to interrupt it.

The Senate originally incorporated in this bill a proposal for an ultimate plebiscite of the native Philippine people themselves in which in an orderly fashion they could say for themselves at the end of this experiment whether or not it is satisfactory and whether or not they want to galvanize it into a permanent situation. One of the authors of the pending bill, the able and distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CUTTING], put particular emphasis—and I honor him for it—upon the opportunity which this ultimate plebiscite was to offer by way of expression of ultimate Philippine opinion as to whether the experiment is a success. But that plebiscite no longer exists. It is stricken from the bill. The natives must decide in advance whether they want to negotiate the risks of separate existence. As the President points out in his message, from the time this experiment actually is launched there is no further opportunity for the natives to retreat or retire from the situation except in subsection (n), and there they find not only an invitation but an opportunity to interrupt the new adventure by forcing our return to authority and power.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I prefer not to yield, as I said in the beginning of my address, and with great respect to the Senator.

The situation that results is simply this in contemplation: Suppose this scheme does not work. Suppose the application of these progressive tariffs does put the native Filipino people in the pincers and as the result of being pinched as they have not previously contemplated they want to retire from the net result of their experiment, they want to stop it. All they have to do to escape is to stage a sufficient riot to invoke American intervention under subsection (n). I am not inviting any such baneful net results. I am not speaking in contemplation even of any such malignant evolution, but I am saying that it typifies the fact that we are here writing a contract, that we are here called upon to commit ourselves to an obligation which is so vague, so

general, so all-inclusive, and yet so utterly dangerous in all of its aspects that no man can contemplate the full force and effect of the thing which we are asked to do and against which the President of the United States, upon his responsibility as the Chief Executive for 125,000,000 people undertakes solemnly to put us upon warning this afternoon.

That is not all. Every Senator knows that these islands are situated in the most treacherous and inflammable sector of this whole upset world. It is a sector where the most casual episode in human events can graduate into a casus belli overnight. We all know what can happen in this way. We have seen it happen in Shanghai. We have seen it happen in Manchuria. There is no rhyme or reason in the evolution of events in this section of the world. We are finding it sufficiently difficult as Americans to steer a safe course through that desperately difficult field of international relations even when we are in complete and intimate control of every movement of our Government and every obligation of our Government.

If that be the contingent jeopardy which we feel—and every Senator in this Chamber feels it—if that be the jeopardy which we feel when we are in complete control of our own destiny in the Far East, Mr. President, what will be our relative jeopardy when we no longer are in complete control, but when we can be involved by implication in any error, however unwitting, which may be committed by a quasi-independent Philippine government operating under the amateur statesmanship—and I do not say that invidiously—of an alien race 10,000 miles away? I submit that it is utter folly for the United States to commit itself to any such indefinite obligation and to any such divided Philippine authority so long as we are responsible for Philippine security. I submit the President of the United States would be less than faithful to his trust as the Chief Executive of this Nation if he did not put us upon warning against these possibilities.

I used the word "folly." I would like to say that the use of that word in this connection is not original. President Hoover is not the only President who has spoken upon this question of American responsibility without authority in the Far East. No. Another President has discussed this same problem. I want to quote again, as I did a month ago in the Senate, from the late President Theodore Roosevelt speaking in 1914. I am now quoting President Theodore Roosevelt:

If the Filipinos are entitled to independence, then we are entitled to be freed from all the responsibility and risk which our presence in the islands entails upon us. * * * To substitute for government by ourselves either a government by the Filipinos with us guaranteeing them against outsiders or a joint guaranty between us and outsiders would be folly.

If it was folly in 1914, in the opinion of Theodore Roosevelt, in the White House or out of it, it is folly in 1933 and hereafter. If it was folly then sufficient to challenge the outspoken statement of Mr. Roosevelt, it certainly is equally sufficient folly to-day to challenge the outspoken statement of the present courageous President of the United States laid upon the bar of the Senate in the message upon which we are about to pass.

"Folly" is the word. It would be impudent to undertake to say what Theodore Roosevelt would do with this bill if he were here to-day. We know beyond peradventure that he would be utterly sympathetic with Philippine aspirations for independence. We know that he would exercise every latitude in undertaking to adopt any formula which undertook to encourage that objective. But what would he say if he were here to-day as President of the United States when confronted by a formula of responsibility without authority, when he said in 1914 that any such dilution would be folly? Can there be but one answer? Ah, Mr. President, I think it is still folly.

Let us follow one consistent theory or the other in dealing with the Philippine question. Let us either pursue the plan of a long-distance preindependent preparation, 15 or 20 years, with progressive tariffs in the interim, and maintaining our authority so long as we maintain our responsibility, or let us provide immediate, complete, and absolute inde-

pendence within the earliest possible moment, which probably, physically speaking, would be two years, withdraw our responsibility at the same time that we withdraw our authority, and then provide a postindependence period for these economic readjustments which can occur upon Philippine responsibility and under their own flag.

The able Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] inquired of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] in the course of previous debate to-day whether he thought it would be possible for any substitute measure in the near future to be passed in the event this one should be declined. The Senator from Arkansas responded rather vaguely. He did not want to say that there was not a good chance, because he knows there is. He knows that if there is any one piece of legislation which is bound to be perfected within the next 12 months in the event this particular bill fails, it is new legislation in respect to independence for the Philippine Islands. If the present bill should be rejected, we have not lost time. We have gained infinitely by the experience through which we have gone. We have had a crystallization and concentration of thought and sentiment upon the subject. It is perfectly obvious to me, I repeat, that the Congress intends the speediest possible relief of the Philippine Islands in response to the obligation and the preamble of the Jones Act of 1916. I repeat that so far as I am concerned, although I have always favored the other theory, I shall cheerfully subscribe to the new theory just so long as it is consistently followed and there is not an effort to dilute it and make a hybrid out of it by creating a compromise formula of some nature which can not be classified with intellectual honesty in either one field or the other.

Mr. CUTTING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have heretofore declined to yield to all Senators because I wanted to conclude promptly, but I shall yield to the Senator from New Mexico in view of the fact that he is one of the authors of the bill.

Mr. CUTTING. I merely wanted to ask the Senator whether he thought in case a new bill should be perfected within the next year, such a bill would be more in harmony than is the present one with the views expressed by himself and the views set forth in the veto message of the President.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am unable to say whether a new bill would be more in harmony with the views expressed in the message. I am very glad to answer categorically the question whether it would be more in harmony with my own views. Inevitably it would not be more in harmony if my views are to be tested by my previous and present feeling that a long period of preparation is advisable. However, Mr. President, that view on my part is utterly secondary and subordinate to the proposition that whatever we shall do shall always be done with American authority and American responsibility coextensive every hour of every day in the Orient. Therefore, a new bill would be more in harmony with the fundamental, paramount concern which I want to see preserved and protected when Philippine legislation finally shall succeed.

So far as the President elect of the United States is concerned, Mr. President, I might digress long enough to say a word respecting his apparent processes of thought. Far be it from me to pose as one of the many spokesmen in his behalf on this floor; I would not care to contribute to that amazing confusion. But it strikes me that the President elect of the United States undertook to make at least one thing plain when he was invited to cooperate with the President of the United States in respect to the problem of war debts, and that is that he is not in favor of responsibility without authority, and anybody who is not in favor of responsibility without authority—and what a desperately dangerous obligation that is when it involves our status in the Far East—can not but agree with the veto message of the present President of the United States at least in connection with this aspect of the matter.

Mr. President, I merely want to refer to one other phase of the subject and then I am done. So far as I am concerned, I have submitted already utterly complete and unanswerable reasons why the veto message of the President of the United States should be sustained, but there is another phase of this subject which has been attracting large attention. I refer to the question of American agriculture and American labor as related to the Philippine problem. The President's message says upon this score:

A large part of the motivation for the passage of this bill is presumed relief to certain American agricultural industries from competition by Philippine products. We are trustees for these people and we must not let our selfish interest dominate that trust.

I cordially concur in that statement. It is inconceivable to me that we should liquidate 30 altruistic years of stewardship and adventure in any sordid and exclusive consultation of self-interest alone. Says the President:

If we are to predicate the fate of 13,000,000 people upon this motive we should at least not mislead our farmers about it.

It is that phase of the matter to which I want to address myself for a concluding few moments. If we are to consider agriculture and labor in the continental United States as controlling factors in answering this problem, let us be frank about what it is we actually and in reality are proposing to do for them. Let us not keep the word of promise to the ear and break it to the hope. Let us make it plain that, so far as agriculture is concerned, it gets a very thinly veneered gold brick so far as this bill goes.

I am not one of those, Mr. President, who deny that we have some reason and right to consult our domestic economic situation in respect to the Philippine Islands. I think we have that right, and this is what I mean: American agriculture is stifled, speaking generally, under a surplus; American agriculture, speaking generally, is to be saved by some sort of a formula of limitation upon production. That being the situation at home, Mr. President, I submit, in simple equity, that there is justification for limitation upon agricultural products in so far as this market is concerned wherever they may be raised under the American flag. The mere fact that they are raised in the Philippine Islands, and thus may be exempted from the particular limitation which we may order by legislation at home, is no reason why they should be immune to a limitation themselves. So while I decline to submit to this domestic consideration as paramount, I decline also to agree that a reasonable consultation of this consideration is not entirely legitimate. I think it is within reason and it is this consultation in respect to the realities that I now want to speak about to the Senate, since, whether we like it or not, it will enter into decisions and votes upon this veto.

I venture the statement that most of the agricultural interests of this country are laboring under the comfortable delusion at the present moment that if this bill shall become a law rather promptly, there are to be some limitations upon Philippine imports into the United States. Well, there is not going to be any such thing, Mr. President. There is no limitation whatever either upon agricultural imports or upon labor for one year, during which time the native legislature, under the terms of the bill, must meet and approve this act upon which we are now passing, during the year when it must provide for the election of delegates to a constitutional convention and when it must assemble that convention. Now, it will certainly take a year to do those three things. There is one year gone, and during that year, Mr. President, there is no limitation whatsoever either upon labor immigration or upon these competitive, stifling agricultural imports into the United States.

Now, how about the next year, the second year? Well, the next year the native convention has got to work out a complete new constitution and has got to send that constitution across the sea to our White House and procure the assent of the President of the United States that it conforms with the schedule of prescriptions in the bill. If the President is dissatisfied with any particular prescription the constitution goes back across the sea; the convention meets

again and undertakes to meet the objection, and, as the bill provides, this process continues until the President and the native convention are in agreement. This might take many years. If deliberately manipulated, it could take practically an indefinite time. If they conclude successfully that process in another year, they will have done exceedingly well. They certainly could not do it under our Senate's rule of debate. There is a second year gone.

During that second year are there any limitations upon Philippine products against which American agriculture insists it is entitled to a new degree of protection? No; not at all. Will there be any less Philippine sugar coming into the United States during the first and second years? No; not at all. It is not a question of importing 800,000 tons, as written in the bill for the first period, when it very belatedly applies; it is a question of 1,100,000 tons that will come this year and of another 1,100,000 tons, probably expanded to a million three hundred thousand tons the second year. There is no limitation upon either of those propositions in this bill. Mr. President, do you think American agriculture realizes that this is the fact? That, however, is not all.

How about the third year? All that has been done so far under the terms of the bill is to write the constitution. Now, how about the third year? Well, the third year the President of the United States has four months in which finally to approve the constitution. Then four months more are allowed for a constitutional referendum in which the natives pass upon the work of the convention, and, assuming that the plebiscite is in the affirmative, then 30 days roll by during which the President proclaims this electoral net result. Then, three months later, there is an election of officers under the new constitution for the new native state. That certainly involves another year. It probably involves much longer time.

Is there any protection during that third year for our agriculture which is supposed to have such a primary stake in this bill? Not at all. There is not a pound of protection in respect to any of the commodities which are supposed to have such a vital stake in the pending measure.

Mr. President, if everything works perfectly, if there are no slips or lapses, if the process is continuous and consecutive, it might be that in four years the first meager limitation would be applied with respect to agricultural imports into the United States. I frankly say that this is not satisfactory to me, nor do I believe it is fair play to our own people. I decline to be indicted for any lack of altruism when I say it. I repeat that it would be infamous, it would be almost treason, to rest a decision in this matter exclusively upon the question of our domestic appetite. But, Mr. President, when a bill is written that does justice to the Philippine situation and to our obligations in all other aspects, then I submit that we are entitled to demand a limitation upon all agriculture under the flag so long as agriculture in the continental United States has to live under limitation and under restraint. After all, equity must be reciprocal or it is not equity.

So I am saying that the thought and belief that there is some sort of early advantage for American agriculture in this bill is a sham and a vote snare and a delusion. If it is any vice to consult domestic welfare of this nature in considering Philippine legislation, it certainly is a double vice to toy with it when it is futile and impotent. Therefore, since it will be at least the fourth year before any of these economic advantages will come to those who seem to think they have such an intimate stake in this legislation, they are infinitely better off that this bill should die at the Senate's bar under the piercing indictment leveled against it by the President of the United States, because surely long before that long and uncertain period would expire—and, in my judgment, well within another year—there would be a new bill which would be far more adequate for the purposes indicated.

So I say, Mr. President—and I have about finished—that no matter from what angle we may wish to approach this question, it seems to me that the President of the United States has laid down a message which is invincible in its

challenge. I could go into larger detail in many other aspects of the case. But this discussion should suffice. It seems to me that I have demonstrated one conclusive reason for supporting the veto; and, on the other hand, that there is no substance to the major reason which heretofore has attracted uninformed support to the bill.

One Senator says:

I am going to vote to override the veto because I want to keep our promise to the Filipinos.

That is a laudable reason; but, Mr. President, as I have said in detail, I repeat in summary that there is no assurance that this is the best answer to the Filipino aspiration. On the contrary, it is well within the prospectus that an infinitely more acceptable answer for the Filipinos themselves will be written if this legislation is denied, particularly if they mean what they say when they ask for immediate, complete, and absolute independence. Indeed, their native legislature may exercise its option itself to reject this measure.

Another Senator says:

I am going to vote to override the veto because I want to get away from the Far East; I want to get out of the Orient; I want to get out of these war zones.

That is a laudable reason and a perfectly understandable one. I heartily share it. But will somebody tell me how we get out of these Far Eastern war zones, how we get out of this most treacherous martial area in all this wide globe, when in effect we half-mast our flag in the Philippine Islands, and maintain responsibility for the integrity of an alien government for a decade and a half after stripping ourselves of commensurate authority to administer this absentee responsibility? This is the way into trouble; not out of it. It is the highway to jeopardy; not to peace and oriental immunities. That is not getting out of any war zones. That is getting squarely into the very heart of hazard in respect of war zones.

Another Senator says, frankly, "I want to help agriculture." I think I have said all I want to say on that subject. I submit that this bill, if it is going to help agriculture, is going to help agriculture after agriculture has entirely and completely expired, if it has to depend upon the provisions of this bill for its future salvation and emancipation at a distant day several years removed.

Another Senator says, "I want to end uncertainty regarding the status of the Philippine Islands." Yes; so do I. I think that uncertainty is the biggest plague resting upon the islands; but the only certainty in this measure is that uncertainty will mark every step, from the initial legislative referendum, through the plebiscite, and down to the moments when we periodically intervene under subsection (n).

From my point of view these Senators find no answer to any of these aspirations in the terms of the bill now pending.

I should not want to take my seat without paying my very deep and affectionate respects to the chief author of this bill. I am referring to the able and distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. Hawes], who has dedicated himself to the cause of Philippine independence with a zeal and a loyalty and a persistence and a persuasion which will do him honor all the days of his life. Nothing that I have said is in any remote sense a reflection upon the fine objectives and purposes and aspirations to which he has dedicated himself with unremitting devotion. I sometimes think that in his generous willingness to compromise with some of us in respect to features and phases of this bill, he may have inadvertently committed the precise type of error against which I inveigh. Nothing that I have said will detract in any degree from the stature of the able senior Senator from Missouri as a devoted defender of Philippine independence. I am sure I voice the sentiment of all his colleagues that we regret his voluntary retirement from this body in the near future. But, Mr. President, without regard to personalities, without regard to any considerations except the fundamental ones to which I have undertaken to devote my analysis, and because I believe that within this measure

is contained inestimable hazard and jeopardy not only for us but for the Philippine Republic to be, I respectfully submit that the President's veto should be sustained. I do so with a rededication to Philippine independence. I do so with a pledge to pursue a better and more consistent formula at once. I do so in the profound conviction that the pending course is the way of error and of folly. I do so in the deep feeling that the President asks for an attitude justified by the realities. I do so in the name of the best and surest welfare of both the Philippine Islands and the United States.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate but a very few minutes in discussion of the measure that now is before the body. My chief purpose in rising is that my ultimate vote on the question may be, to some degree at least, understood.

Very frankly, Mr. President, I want to get out of the Philippines. I want to get the United States out of the Philippines at the earliest possible moment; and I will vote for any reasonable measure that has for its object the removal of American responsibility and authority in that archipelago.

I want to get out for three reasons.

First of all, because I think it is for the best interests of the American people, who, in any deliberations or action taken here, should have their interests first considered.

Second, I want to get out of the Philippine Islands because the Filipinos themselves want us out, and have made it decidedly embarrassing for us to remain in with plebiscite after plebiscite, referendum after referendum, resolution after resolution in their legislative body, almost unanimously adopted, demanding that we get out, bag and baggage, regardless of the marvelous altruism we have displayed through some 34 years in doing everything possible in their behalf.

The third reason I want to get out, Mr. President, is because it is perfectly clear to me, and I think entirely patent to every Member of this body, that we can not possibly defend our sovereignty in the Philippines from an aggressive external foe.

I was very much interested in the remarks of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who has just resumed his seat; but I can not follow his reasoning to the conclusion, at any rate, that he seems to reach. I have heard him make the statement time and again on this floor that he never wants to see the American flag at half-mast in the Philippines. I point out to him, if he is in the Chamber at the moment—if not, I hope he will read what I have to say on that subject—that the American flag has been at half-mast in the Philippines ever since the Senate of the United States ratified the treaty that was the child of the Washington conference in 1921 and 1922. Never after that treaty was ratified was there a chance on earth for America to defend her sovereignty in the Philippine Islands, and never will there be a chance if we continue to permit the American Navy to deteriorate year after year as has been its experience during the past decade and more.

External interference! Why, Mr. President, this bill undertakes to get us out of there and out of that responsibility in 10 years, and with a period of readjustment of perhaps 4 years—a grand total of 14. We may become involved during these 14 years. I hope not. The islands in that time might be attacked by an external foe. I hope not; and, of course, when we refer to oriental powers we mean Japan. There is no occasion, as I see it, in this body to mince words; but I am hoping we may have good luck and good fortune enough to escape war with that power or any other during the next 14 years; and then we are out, and we are out for good, and for all time to come. But under the plan suggested by the Senator from Michigan we are still in, and we will be in the next year, and we will be in the following years, as we have been for 34 years; and I see no possible means ever of escape if we continue to procrastinate and never subscribe to any plan of action.

He speaks with confidence about what the next Congress will do under Democratic administration. I confess to him

and to my colleagues here that I have no confidence that it will do anything effective; but if it did anything with reference to the Philippines, it would be different from what they did in eight years when they were in control of the Government, because during those eight years we remained in the Philippine Islands, and we were just as much in when that administration ended as we were when it began. So I am in favor of taking definite action so that the 14 years, if it requires that long, may begin to run and be counted off, hoping, as I said before, that nothing will happen during those 14 years to injure the Republic or its good name.

Mr. President, we adopted a policy in 1922, I think very foolishly, of agreeing never to fortify any of our possessions in the Far East, and the moment we adopted that policy we served notice to the world that America's final outpost in the Pacific was Pearl Harbor, Honolulu, 2,100 miles west of San Francisco. Five thousand miles on beyond Honolulu is Manila, and it is the capital of this enormous archipelago, which is an empire in itself, with more than 7,000 islands, extending more than a thousand miles north and south in the Pacific, and 600 miles east and west, on the doorstep of Japan. There are more than 13,000,000 people there, and we maintain out there a garrison of fewer than 7,000 troops, practically all native soldiers, good peace-time soldiers, but no one knows what they might do in time of war. That is fewer than one soldier to the island, which means we have no garrison there at all.

We have a so-called naval base on Manila Bay, just around a little way from Manila, known as Cavite, which employs some three or four thousand natives, the scale of wages being higher than anywhere else in the Orient. In fact, the United States has raised the standard of living in the Philippines 300 per cent above any standard in the Orient. Yet the water is so shallow at Cavite that even if we had not signed a treaty in 1921 or 1922, it would be absolutely impossible for any of our large capital ships to get in there to dock. There are no dry-dock facilities at all.

In fact, we have only one arrangement for dry docking in the entire Orient, and that is at Olangapo, 60 miles from Corregidor, guarding the bay, which could be taken by Japan or any other nation overnight. There we have the old *Dewey*, a floating dry dock, not large enough to take capital ships at all. So that we can not make repairs of any kind in the Far East to any of our warships. We would have no means of getting munitions there in case of emergency, no means of taking care of our forces there in case of emergency, and no certainty of any loyalty on the part of the Filipinos themselves in case of an emergency. The islands are 7,000 miles from home and we have no bases.

The Senator from Michigan speaks of a possible *casus belli* during the next 14 years. I say to him that if it is a *casus belli* during the next 14 years, it has been for the past 34 years, and that is all the more reason why we ought to try to get out as quickly as possible, and adopt a plan for getting out, and have the years start being counted off.

Mr. President, it would be a serious matter if there were an emergency, a war in the Orient, so far as we are concerned. I know what war means, and we all do. We are in the midst of the direct results of war now, in this, the worst depression the world has ever known. I do not want war again if it can be avoided. I suppose no one does. But because I believe that the Philippine Islands are always in the position to drag us into war with the only nation on earth which to-day seems to be war-minded especially, I want to make every effort to be relieved of that responsibility at the earliest possible moment.

I go farther, Mr. President, and suggest to the Members of this body that it would be a difficult matter to get the American people interested in a war 7,000 miles from home after the bitter experience they have just had with war, and are still having, in the midst of which we now exist, or almost exist.

Still further, unless there were no honorable way to avoid it, I would never vote to send a single American soldier 7,000 miles away to the Orient to die for the Philippine Islands and their ungrateful people. In other words, there is such

a thing as thinking of the American people. We have obligations and a responsibility here to our own people, as well as to the natives of the Philippines.

Mr. President, we have given them modern cities out there, and sanitation, have improved their agricultural conditions, have given them the means and facilities for education and cultural advancement. We have given them free trade with this country. I want to be temperate in any statement I make, and I think I am when I say that they have evidenced no sign of gratitude for all these blessings conferred upon them by the American people. In spite of it all we hear from morning to night, and you hear it there if you go there, "The United States of America is unwanted here and Uncle Sam should take all of his equipment, his bags and baggage, and get out."

That makes it difficult, as I said before, for us to stay in without embarrassment, and it is a little hard for me to become interested in the argument that we owe the Filipinos a great moral responsibility to stay there and look after them when they constantly order us out.

I think it is better for the American farmer also that we should get out. The Filipino sells his products here in competition with agriculture in this country and pays no duty. He is on a free-trade basis. Their people come in here without any restriction, and that interferes with American labor and the American living standard, because the standards in the Philippines, while higher than anywhere else in the Orient, are still much lower than the American standard.

I am wondering what real reason can be advanced for rejecting this measure, unless, indeed, we could draw a perfect bill, to which a majority of this body and the body at the other end of the Capitol would agree. I submit that for 34 years we have tried to get such a bill without any effective result, and I believe the pending measure is the best the Congress can agree on. Since we have a measure, and it is so near completion, it seems to me to be the duty of the Senate immediately to adopt that measure.

Mr. President, I go back to the possible chance of war. I was not in accord, as many of my colleagues know, with the results reached at the London conference, when we agreed to take 6-inch cruisers with no bases anywhere on earth to speak of except at Pearl Harbor, therefore no facilities for refueling or reconditioning. With the need for having large fuel-carrying capacity, as well as large-caliber guns, for all of our cruisers, in the absence of bases, I was opposed to surrendering to Great Britain and to Japan on the small-cruiser proposition, the 7,500-ton, 6-inch gun arrangement. But we surrendered, and when we did so we pulled the flag just a little lower than half-mast in the Orient, and made it just that much more difficult to defend our sovereignty out there.

Now, it has gotten to the point where we are a distinct third among the navies of the earth—Britain first, Japan second, the United States third. And here we are 7,000 miles away from the Philippines with this difficult problem now chargeable to us, responsibility for maintaining law and order there on our shoulders, and some Members of this body and of the body at the other end of the Capitol insisting that we stay a while longer, in the hope that somehow or other, in some way, by some hocus-pocus, we may find a bill that may be more satisfactory than the pending one.

Mr. President, it seems to me that in the interest of a safe and sure American policy we ought to get out of the Philippines. Some one suggested waiting a while. In fact, those opposed to the bill want to wait. Do they want to wait until they are certain there will be a definite, distinct nationality in the Philippines? Then they would wait forever. None of the means for building nationality are there.

The inhabitants of the Philippines speak four basic languages—three especially, Spanish, some English, and mostly Tagalog—and literally hundreds of dialects. So thoroughly true is this, that the politicians out there in their campaigns, going from island to island, are forced to take interpreters with them. They are unable to be understood by the people they attempt to convince.

Daily newspapers are published in three languages—Spanish, English, and Tagalog—and the total circulation of the newspapers for 13,000,000 people is less than 200,000. They have no means for developing a national language or national public opinion. There is no means for developing a nation, and if we are going to remain until all these means have been perfected, we will remain there for the next thousand years.

What will happen in the Philippines when we get out? I have my idea about it. I think the results will be bad for the Filipinos. I think there is no question about it in the world. Time and again they will wish they were back under the ægis of the American flag, but it will be too late then.

My judgment is that there will be difficulties of all kinds there almost immediately our sovereignty is completely ended; but that is their responsibility. Our first responsibility is to the American people and to avoid war with any nation. When I see American veterans over the United States assailed and libeled and slandered and villified on all sides, it brings the old question quickly to my mind, "What price glory?" I want no more war. Those veterans want no more war. The American people want no more war if it can honorably be evaded. I do not mind saying to my colleagues on the floor of the Senate to-day that that is one of the principal reasons why I shall vote to override the President's veto. I think the longer we remain in the Philippine Islands, the longer and more dangerously we play with fire, the more closely we bring war to the citizens of the American Republic. Because of that fact, because I want to avoid it as far as I possibly can with my vote, and for the additional reasons which I have tried to state briefly in what I have said this afternoon, I shall vote to override the veto of the President.

Mr. HAWES obtained the floor.

Mr. CUTTING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to enable me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield for that purpose?

Mr. HAWES. I do.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Cutting	Johnson	Schall
Austin	Dale	Kendrick	Schuyler
Bailey	Davis	Keyes	Sheppard
Bankhead	Dickinson	King	Shortridge
Barbour	Dill	La Follette	Smith
Barkley	Fess	Lewis	Smoot
Bingham	Fletcher	Logan	Steiwer
Black	Frazier	Long	Swanson
Blaine	George	McGill	Thomas, Idaho
Borah	Glass	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Bratton	Glenn	McNary	Townsend
Broussard	Goldsborough	Metcalf	Trammell
Bulkeley	Gore	Moses	Tydings
Bulow	Grammer	Norbeck	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Hale	Norris	Wagner
Capper	Harrison	Nye	Walcott
Caraway	Hastings	Oddie	Walsh, Mass.
Carey	Hatfield	Patterson	Walsh, Mont.
Connally	Hawes	Pittman	Watson
Coolidge	Hayden	Reynolds	Wheeler
Copeland	Hebert	Robinson, Ark.	White
Costigan	Howell	Robinson, Ind.	
Couzens	Hull	Russell	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. HAWES. Mr. President, turning to the veto message of the Philippine independence bill, I find in it expressions and opinions with which each of the 21 members of the House committee and, I may add, each of the 11 members of the Senate committee is familiar. Frequently I am surprised when I read one of our great newspapers which seek to create the impression that this subject of Philippine independence has not been thoroughly discussed. I venture the assertion that no other subject which has come before the House and the Senate in recent years has been more fully debated than this one. On two occasions your Senate committee devoted many days, even weeks, to hearings on this question. The same is true of the House committee.

There is not a single contention in the President's veto message that has not been presented either to the House committee or the Senate committee. In the hearings before the House and the Senate committees there was absolute unanimity as to one fact; that is, the uncertain status of the Philippine Islands. Every witness—whether speaking for the Army, the Navy, the farmer, the manufacturer, union labor, or the exporter—without an exception each of them stated that a condition exists which should be settled and settled quickly by the Congress. There was a discussion about the length of time which should intervene between the act of Congress and the final culmination of independence. The distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] had a theory of his own. It was not accepted by any other Member of the House or the Senate. He has several times very eloquently and very forcefully presented his theory to the Senate, and there is no need, therefore, to explain it now.

Only one witness fully supports the theory of the President's veto and that witness is the Secretary of War. It would almost seem that after the House committee and the Senate committee had decided the question, and both House and Senate, by an overwhelming vote had ratified those decisions, the Secretary of War has appealed from both branches of Congress to the President of the United States. It appears to be the view of the War Department that is embodied in the veto message.

Mr. President, when we first came into possession of the Philippines President McKinley made it quite clear, not only to the Filipinos, but to the Americans and to the world, that we were there for only a temporary period, and, the Army being in the Philippines, the administration of those islands was to be left to the War Department. Each succeeding administration has considered the status of the Philippines, and always it has been decided that their occupancy should be temporary; but meanwhile the administration of civil affairs in the Philippine Islands has remained in the War Department. I assert, Mr. President, that this great Republic of ours is the only Nation in the world under which the civil government of colonial possessions remains in the military branch of the Government.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, a student of oriental questions, introduced a bill sometime ago taking from the War Department the administration of the civil affairs of our colonies; and I venture to predict, Mr. President, that the next Congress of the United States will deprive the War Department of such jurisdiction and vest it either in the Department of State or the Department of the Interior, where it belongs.

Year after year the War Department has broadcast propaganda against the independence of the Philippine people. During the entire course of the congressional investigation of the subject, that is to say, for three years, it has been the opposition of the War Department which we have had to confront. There was opposition from hardly any other source. So we see the anomaly of a Government which, though it puts its own civil administration above its military affairs, nevertheless permits its War Department to control the destiny of the Philippines.

The President's message speaks about the liberty the Philippine people have. Let us see of what that liberty consists. It consists of having their civil affairs administered by the War Department of the American Government. A Governor General is appointed; he is paid \$18,000 a year; he is supplied with a palace, a yacht, and a set of civil advisors, for whom the Philippine people pay \$125,000 a year. All the expenses of his office come from the pockets of the Philippine people.

Mr. President, in discussing very briefly some of the points made in the President's veto message I especially emphasize certain of them because they were the same points that were presented by the Secretary of War when he testified before both the House and the Senate committees, and which were almost unanimously rejected by both those committees.

The House of Representatives, having spoken on one side and the Senate having spoken on the other, and both sides having repudiated the position of the War Department, now that department goes to the President of the United States, it would appear, and, as a consequence, we are asked to support a veto predicated not on the civil aspects of the bill, but on objections urged by the Department of War.

The message states that for the good of the Philippine people this bill should not be signed. Who should speak for the Philippine people—the Secretary of War or their own representatives? Mr. President, if the situation were reversed and the Congress of the United States were appealing to the government of the Philippine Islands for liberty and freedom, and we should select as a delegation from this body the Vice President, the distinguished Democratic floor leader [Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas], and the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. WARSON] as the third member, representing the Senate, and then we should take the Speaker of the House, the majority leader [Mr. RAINEY] and the minority leader [Mr. SNELL] as the other members of the delegation, we would be creating exactly the same kind of commission as that which has come from the Philippine Islands to appeal to this Congress. Who is to speak for the Filipino people, if the men who have been appointed to represent them and have come to the United States for that purpose can not? Upon whom will fall the responsibility of failure, if the bill should fail? Not on the Secretary of War and the American Nation, but upon the representatives of the Filipino people. The Philippine delegation selected in the way I have indicated called upon the President of the United States, and, without any dissent, without any division whatsoever, appealed to him by word of mouth and by way of written memorandum to convince him that they, as the representatives of 13,000,000 people, wanted this bill approved and signed.

The assertion has been made that there is some danger to American sovereignty and to American power during the 10-year period of readjustment contemplated in this bill. Men who have actually exercised the power of government in the Philippines are the best witnesses as to that, and I summon as the first of these witnesses Dr. Jacob Gould Schurman, who was the chairman of the first civil commission that went to the Philippine Islands in 1899. Let Senators read his statement. They will find that he approves this bill and says that American sovereignty in the Philippines is protected during the interim. To be brief, and to avoid too much detail concerning the extension of that authority, which is so carefully set out in the records of both the House and the Senate and repeated time and again on the floor of the Senate, let me summon just one more witness, Mr. W. Cameron Forbes, who was for several years Governor General of the Philippine Islands, and who is the author of what I regard as the greatest book on those islands ever written by an American. He understands the subject thoroughly and took such great interest in this measure that he came to Washington and went over those sections of the bill relating to American sovereignty. I personally introduced in the Senate an amendment to increase the safeguards of that sovereignty. That amendment was prepared by ex-Governor General Forbes. It was placed in the bill; it is there now, and so long, Mr. President, as our flag floats over the Philippine Islands this bill, if it shall become a law, will require from every human being in the Philippines and throughout the world respect for the power and authority of the United States. To suggest that that sovereignty will be impaired or imperiled by this bill is to make a statement that can not be supported by facts.

In one section of his message the President suggests that the time of 10 years for readjustment is too short, that it ought to be 15 or 20 years. He says that that period is too short for the Philippine farmer, and then discusses the question of the limitation of Philippine imports into this country as it affects the American farmer. On the one hand, he talks about protection for the Philippines and then, on the other hand, he suggests that there is no adequate protection for our farmers.

A curious thing appears in his message. The President discusses the limitation on sugar imports, taking the year 1928 as the basis of his comparison, in order to show that the American farmer is not protected.

He says that during the five years following the acceptance of the bill by the Filipinos the measure "gives no effective protection because the amount of competitive commodities admitted into the United States duty free is in sugar 50 per cent larger than that of 1928; vegetable oils 25 per cent." I have not been able to determine why the President or the Secretary of War selected the year 1928. Why not select 1929 or 1930 or 1931 or 1932? Why go back five years?

Mr. President, why, I ask again, should the President or the Secretary of War select the year 1928? In 1928 there were 517,000 long tons of sugar imported from the Philippines to the United States. In 1931 there were 700,000 long tons. For the last 10 months there were 854,000 long tons; and it is estimated very conservatively by a number of the departments that the import of sugar for 1933 will be 1,000,000 tons; and yet the figure of 1928 is sent to the American people as the standard of comparison! I can not explain it. I can not understand it.

I cite another strange assertion; I am persuaded the statement came from the Secretary of War, because we heard it from him when he appeared before the Senate and House committees. We are told in the message that 40 per cent of the territory of the Philippines is occupied by non-Christian people—by Moros.

It is strange that the President or the Secretary of War should thus calculate acres and square miles of territory when he must know that the Moros are only 4 per cent of the population of the Philippines, and that in most of the Provinces of which he speaks the Christian Filipinos greatly outnumber the Moros.

Reference is made in the message to difficulties that might arise upon the withdrawal of our sovereignty over the Philippines. This is always the worry of the imperialist. We still have a few imperialists in America. They are ashamed to admit it. At one time we had many imperialists who wanted to follow the course of empire with England or France or Holland as their exemplar. What prompts this fear of disaster if we quit the Philippines? People of only two nationalities migrate to the Philippines. One of those peoples is the Japanese. The other is the Chinese. There are only 8,000 Japanese in the islands now. There have been that many there for years. Their number in the islands is not increasing. The present laws of the Philippines limit Chinese immigration to those islands; and that limitation, of course, would continue under a new government.

That disposes of the question of infiltration of other nationalities.

The President reminds us that a little nation, not very rich, could not support an army adequate to protect itself against invasion. Why, Mr. President, our Army officers will tell you that with from 60,000 to 80,000 capable, well-trained American troops in the islands our own Government would find it difficult to hold those islands until help should come from the United States, 10,000 miles across the sea. What is the source of danger to the Filipinos? Not from the Japanese. The Japanese do not like the Philippine Islands. They do not like the climate there. They are expanding to the north, not to the south. The Chinese do not want to colonize the Philippines. They are traders. They are not agriculturists. Certainly there is no danger from England or from France or Holland; so whence the menace to the Filipino people? In my judgment, it has its origin in the imagination of the imperialist, who is ashamed to admit that he is an imperialist and would pose as a patriot.

Something has been said here about the reservation of American naval stations in the Philippines. Under this bill every acre of ground is to be under the ownership and control of the United States until the President of the United States shall release it or change its status. It is not for the Filipinos, it is for the President of the United States to determine that question at the proper time.

Let me turn to another matter that has twice been broached here to-day, Mr. President. It is the President's remarkable statement in his veto message that emigration from the Philippines to the United States must be stopped immediately. Mr. President, time and time again have the distinguished Senators and Representatives from California and other States of the Pacific coast—the distinguished Congressman from California [Mr. WELCH] and others—brought that subject before the committees of the House and Senate. In every case these committees and Members in debate in the House and in the Senate have stated that such an act would be politically immoral, and that no committee would sponsor it in the House and no committee would sponsor it in the Senate. Even the head of the Bureau of Insular Affairs appeared recently—within the last two years—to protest against that sort of exclusion, unless it was accompanied by a declaration favoring independence for the islands.

Mr. President, so far as I am able to ascertain, there is no nation in the world, whether its people be black or brown or red or yellow, which does not permit its colonials to come to the mother country at their own will; and the American Congress can not be expected to do less for our colonials than Great Britain and France and Holland do for theirs.

The message contains a curious intimation in a reference to the Philippine Scouts. The Philippine Scouts are part of the American Army—some 6,000 of them. We have had them there for nearly 25 years. What have they done during that 25 years? I can find no record in Philippine history that the Philippine Scouts have been called upon to put down an insurrection of Filipinos, or that the scout force has ever been brought into action for the benefit of the Filipinos. They have their constabulary of 6,000 men paid out of their own treasury. This constabulary is their national police. It is all they need. So the contention that they must have an army, remembering that it would take from 60,000 to 80,000 American troops to hold those islands, is, upon its face, an extravagance. They do not want an army. They do not require an army. The army we have had there has never had any conflict or friction with the Filipinos since the insurrection.

When the World War came, 25,000 Filipinos enlisted under the Stars and Stripes. Their subscriptions to the Red Cross were equal to those of any part of America. Their subscription for Liberty bonds was enormous; and 49 per cent of its total came from the pockets of the humbler Filipinos. We took out of the Philippines every white soldier. No troops were left there during the period of the war but Filipinos. The people of the islands tendered to the United States Government a small battleship. They served in our Navy. There was nothing but patriotism there, nothing but loyalty to the United States of America.

We have, too, the intimation that they should have a navy. Well, if the great American Navy, even with the limitations placed upon it by the 4-power treaty of 1921, could not permanently hold back a first-class oriental power, what an absurdity it is to talk about the Philippine people requiring or acquiring a navy!

It seems that some one has depended on fancy for some of the reasons for vetoing this bill—a bill that has been before the Congress for three years, on which committees of both the House and the Senate have agreed, and which both the House and the Senate have approved by passing it with overwhelming votes; and then, at the eleventh hour, when the promise of America is about to be redeemed, we are dinning with the old stock arguments of the War Department.

This veto message is in almost the same language as that in the statement made by the Secretary of War before the committees of the House and the Senate, and discounted by both committees. The thought of the committees and of the two Houses of Congress is set aside. The War Department now says to the civil government, "You can not have this liberty unless you grant it in our way."

I say to the Members of the Senate that we tried to accommodate the Secretary of War, but he demanded the

impossible. When he was asked whether he would grant Philippine independence in 5 years, or 15 years, or 20 years, or 50 years, he refused to answer. He sought to predicate independence on a purely hypothetical and contingent situation in the future. He asserted his right and ability to predict with certainty the events of 20 years yet to come, but denied to Congress the power to look even 10 years into the future. No lawyer, save one who was also a prophet, could frame a bill according to the peculiar specifications of the Secretary of War, and no Congress would enact such a measure even if it could be devised. So independence has been opposed by the War Department persistently, relentlessly. Mr. President, imperialism in the United States is concealed, but it is not dead.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of to-day, entitled "The Philippine Bill," and also an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of to-day, entitled "A Disgraceful Vote."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of Saturday, January 14, 1933]

THE PHILIPPINE BILL

The movement in this country for Philippine independence has had a history which now seems almost ironic. At first the motives behind it were unselfish, or at any rate idealistic. We were going to exemplify in a grand way old American principles of government only with the consent of the governed. We were to set at liberty a race enslaved for hundreds of years. In the words of one of President McKinley's messages—he was quoting from a poem by his own Secretary of State, John Hay—we were asking the Filipinos and the whole world—

"Why read ye not the changeless truth,
The free can conquer but to save?"

The struggle to give freedom to the Philippines on that high ground was kept alive for several years but never came to triumph. Party platforms and Presidents of both parties kept on promising the eventual independence of the Filipinos, but there were always reservations and hesitations, so that the pledges never were fulfilled, and it began to look as if they never would be. But presently a coarser and more sordid spirit began to take up the agitation, and then it marched on rapidly. Large sections of the country became persuaded that it would be a good thing to set the Philippines free, so as to prevent them longer from competing with American sugar and vegetable oils and fibers.

In all this there was no pretense of love of liberty. It was love of gain, or the hope of it, that led the sugar growers and the others to combine for the purpose of first ruining the Filipinos by setting up a protective and prohibitory tariff against their exports to the United States and then bidding them govern themselves in a way to meet our approval and prevent complications with other nations. There has been no concealment of the fact that crass selfishness and congressional logrolling brought about the passage of the Philippine bill. President McKinley spoke in a lofty tone of our duty toward "the gems and glories of the tropic seas." But the lobbyists for special interests put all that nonsense behind them when they drafted a law ostensibly for the benefit of the Filipinos but in reality for assuring profits to special classes of Americans.

All of this and more is set forth in the long and carefully studied message which President Hoover sent to Congress yesterday when returning the Philippine bill without his approval. His analysis of its defects, from the administrative and international point of view, as well as of its bearing upon the responsibilities of the United States, was penetrating. The difficulties and dangers which the measure would at once thrust upon both the Philippines and the United States are accurately stated by the President. It is not necessary to elaborate them here. They were not in the least weighed by the House of Representatives, which at once proceeded by tumultuous vote to override the presidential veto. This result was expected. The hope of more cautious and mature action lies in the Senate.

In that body there are doubtless some Members ready to be as short-sighted and reckless as the Representatives, and to delight in humiliating President Hoover. But what about the Senators who are close to Governor Roosevelt and who would be influenced by an intimation of his wishes? It has been understood that he is not satisfied with the present form of the Philippine bill. His senatorial supporters could not desire to see Philippine troubles heaped upon the others which will confront him as soon as he becomes President. If they are well advised they will join with Senators of like sober mind in upholding the President's veto of a bill which is stamped all over with selfishness and which has wrapped up in it incalculable national perils.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of Saturday, January 14, 1933]

A DISGRACEFUL VOTE

President Hoover's veto of the Philippine bill is a masterful state document. It will take rank among the great presidential messages. That the House should override it without seriously

attempting to meet its arguments is an act at once discreditable and alarming. No more disgraceful vote stands on the House record. The utter lack of conscience shown by these supposed Representatives of the American people is an ominous threat. When 274 elected legislators can thus scramble to haul down the American flag it is every citizen's right to worry as to what possession of the Nation is safe.

The President's message fairly vibrates with suppressed feeling. Between the lines is an eloquent expression of regret for all the disillusionment at home and disgrace abroad which the congressional handling of this Philippine problem has already bred. He leaves no doubt in the mind of any reader how intensely he resents the submission to him of a measure so patently sordid and selfish in inspiration, so shockingly irresponsible and so full of menace to this country's 13,000,000 oriental wards and to the future peace and welfare of the American people themselves.

There is no need to retrace the logical steps through which President Hoover leads up to his conclusion that: "This legislation puts both our people and the Philippine people not on the road to liberty and safety, which we desire, but on the path leading to new and enlarged dangers to liberty and freedom itself." No brief review can do justice to the President's powerful outline of the absurd position of responsibility without authority in which this bill would put the guardians of America's rights and good name on the other side of the Pacific. No paraphrase can do justice to his very restrained but damning charges that the benefits which the authors of the bill contemplated "inure more largely to foreign producers than to our own farmers" and that our farm interests have been misled by those who solicited their support for the bill.

President Hoover shows that the measures for weaning the Philippines from us economically would impoverish them, not ultimately but immediately, so that they could not possibly maintain the forces to deal with the internal disorder which an economic collapse would promote. Without adequate civil authority the representatives of the American Government in the islands would be impotent witnesses of conditions which might promote serious friction with the non-Christian population, and might even embroil the islands with other governments. He dwells briefly but effectively upon the fact that the end which Congress thinks it is achieving is the betterment of the American farmer, but that the advantage would go very largely to non-American interests and that the farm supporters of the bill have been misled, while West coast interests would suffer heavily if the bill were to go into effect. The President regards the arrangement by which the Filipinos must decide on independence at the beginning instead of at the end of the period of economic adjustment as unfair, and he finally sees in the measure as a whole the ruin of the Philippines and a serious threat to the peace of this country and of the world at large.

It is on record, and will be forever kept on record, that on receipt of this document showing that this Philippine bill is a cynical repudiation of responsibility to the Filipinos, the American people, and a watchful and scornful world, 274 Members of the House of Representatives made indecent haste to reaffirm their indifference to this country's best interests. Incidentally, they thereby displayed their loyalty to the powerful sugar lobby which has organized, misinformed, and herded into action the domestic groups that think their interests might be served by this bill.

Such a vote is a discredit to a member of any party. For it is not only in opposition to the Republican Party, or to a Republican administration, or in contempt of a Republican President, it is anti-American and in contempt of a Chief Executive who champions America's welfare and appeals for consideration of America's honor. But it seems to us, and we think it must seem to all Republicans, that in reaffirming their stand against their party's policies and traditions, as well as against their country's interest and good name, the Republicans who voted with the mob in the House are entitled to a particularly invidious distinction. To this we therefore nominate them, reproducing here the full tally of those Republicans who thereby betrayed a Republican President and the Republican electorate:

ADKINS, of Illinois; AMLIE, of Wisconsin; ANDREWS, of New York; BACHMANN, of West Virginia; BARBOUR, of California; BEEDY, of Maine; BOILEAU, of Wisconsin; BOWMAN, of West Virginia; BRAND, of Ohio; BURNETT, of North Dakota; CAMPBELL, of Iowa; CAMPBELL, of Pennsylvania; CARTER, of California; CHRISTGAU, of Minnesota; COLTON, of Utah; CULKIN, of New York; DE PRIEST, of Illinois; DOWELL, of Iowa; DYER, of Missouri; ENGLEBRIGHT, of California; ERK, of Pennsylvania; EVANS, of California; FISH, of New York; FREAR, of Wisconsin; FREE, of California; GABER, of Oklahoma; GIFFORD, of Massachusetts; GILCHRIST, of Iowa; GUYER, of Kansas; HADLEY, of Washington; HALL, of Illinois; HAUGEN, of Iowa; HOCH, of Kansas; HOGG, of Indiana; HOGG, of West Virginia; HOLADAY, of Illinois; HOPE, of Kansas; JAMES, of Michigan; KADING, of Wisconsin; KAHN, of California; KELLY, of Pennsylvania; KETCHAM, of Michigan; KINZER, of Pennsylvania; KOPP, of Iowa; LA GUARDIA, of New York; LAMBERTSON, of Kansas; LANKFORD, of Virginia; LEAVITT, of Montana; LOOPBOUROW, of Utah; LOVETTE, of Tennessee; MCGUGIN, of Kansas; MAAS, of Minnesota; MANLOVE, of Missouri; MICHENER, of Michigan; MOORE, of Ohio; MURPHY, of Ohio; PEAVEY, of Wisconsin; PERKINS, of New Jersey; PITTINGER, of Minnesota; REID, of Illinois; ROBINSON, of Iowa; SCHAFER, of Wisconsin; SCHNEIDER, of Wisconsin; SEGER, of New Jersey; SELVIG, of Minnesota; SINCLAIR, of North Dakota; SPARKS, of Kansas; STRONG, of Kansas; SUMMERS, of Washington; SWANSON, of Iowa; SWING, of California; TABER, of New York; TAYLOR, of Tennessee; THURSTON, of Iowa; TIMBERLAKE, of Colorado; TURPIN, of Pennsylvania; WELCH, of California; WIL-

LIAMSON, of South Dakota; WITHROW, of Wisconsin; WOLCOTT, of Michigan; WOLVERTON, of New Jersey; and WOODRUFF, of Michigan.

An excuse put forward by certain of these Republicans was the fear that a yet worse bill might be enacted by the next Congress. Here is surely a new low level in legislative alibis. How a worse bill could be conceived no one is able to point out—either more unfair to the Filipino or a greater betrayal of American interests. But how can any self-respecting Representative make such an excuse for failing to perform his own simple, instant duty? Let the next Congress and the next President face the American people and do what they dare. The duty of these legislators is here and now, and their excuse is a measure of their character.

We know that our readers will wish to go through Mr. Hoover's message carefully. It is a landmark in American history, deserving of study by every patriotic citizen. May the Members of the Senate give it equal attention! Their duty is a grave one. The country looks to them to save where the House has failed.

ATTITUDE OF CERTAIN INTERESTS TOWARD THE BANKING BILL

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I submit a resolution which I ask may lie on the table.

The resolution (S. Res. 326) was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Whereas conflicting statements have been made in the press that the big banking interests of the United States are fighting for and against the so-called Glass banking bill; and

Whereas it is essential that the Senate be fully informed with respect to the truth of such statements: Therefore be it

Resolved, That a special committee of five Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, three from the majority political party, and two from the minority political party, is authorized and directed to investigate the statements made in the press with respect to the opposition by the big banking interests to the so-called Glass banking bill (S. 4412), and said committee is likewise directed to investigate the charges that certain people and banks are lobbying in favor of said banking bill, and to report to the Senate, as soon as practicable, the results of its investigations, together with its recommendations.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions and recesses of the Senate in the Seventy-second Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$10,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

ROANOKE COLONY COMMISSION (S. DOC. NO. 171)

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I desire to present a privileged report and ask that it may be printed and also be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG. I wish to know what is the report?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. It is a report of the Roanoke Colony Commission, required by law to report not later than to-day.

Mr. LONG. Very well.

The report was ordered to be printed and also to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Senate Document No. 171, Seventy-second Congress, second session]

UNITED STATES ROANOKE COLONY COMMISSION

Report of the United States Roanoke Colony Commission, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution No. 26, on plans for the commemoration in 1934 of the three hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the birth of English-speaking civilization in America on Roanoke Island, N. C., presented by Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas January 10 (calendar day, January 14), 1933, and ordered to be printed

The United States Roanoke Colony Commission, created by act of Congress to prepare and report a plan or plans and a program for the commemoration in 1934 of the three hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the birth of English-speaking civilization in America on Roanoke Island, N. C., with an estimate of the probable cost, and for other purposes, as specified in House Concurrent Resolution No. 26, Seventy-second Congress, first session, respectfully reports as follows:

That pursuant to said resolution the following members of said commission were appointed:

On the part of the Senate: Hon. JOSEPH T. ROBINSON, of Arkansas; Hon. GEORGE B. MOSES, of New Hampshire; and Hon. HARRY B. HAWES, of Missouri.

On the part of the House: Hon. LINDSAY C. WARREN, of North Carolina; Hon. SOL BLOOM, of New York; and Hon. ISAAC BACHARACH, of New Jersey.

This commission met and, pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution No. 26, selected a chairman and vice chairman from among their members, as follows: Hon. JOSEPH T. ROBINSON, chairman; Hon. LINDSAY C. WARREN, vice chairman.

This commission visited Roanoke Island, in North Carolina, August 15, 1932, inspected the site of old Fort Raleigh and other points of historic interest on said island and in the immediate vicinity.

The commission found the earthenwork of the fort erected by the Amadas and Barlowe Expedition of 1584 still plainly visible. The site of this historic fort marks the spot where Captains Amadas and Barlowe, on July 4, 1584, landed upon Roanoke Island in their search for a favorable colonization site. Here came the subsequent colonies from England sent out by Sir Walter Raleigh, and here at this fort, August 18, 1587, was born Virginia Dare, the first child born in America of English-speaking parents.

The site of this historic fort is marked only by a simple badly defaced marker erected some years ago.

This commission found that Roanoke Island had been made accessible during the last three years to Jamestown, Williamsburg, Yorktown, Norfolk, and therefore to the country at large.

This commission is convinced that because of the centuries of isolation of Roanoke Island and its inaccessibility to the outside world, nothing more than above noted has been made of the fact that the first English settlement in America was upon Roanoke Island and that from these beginnings English-speaking civilization in America had its inception.

This commission has made a careful examination of historic documents authenticating these first settlements and is convinced that but for the pioneer work of Sir Walter Raleigh and his associates, encouraged by their queen, Elizabeth, the final permanent settlement at Jamestown would never have been attempted or effected and the subsequent history of America would have been entirely different. Instead of an English-speaking civilization in America we would have had a French or Spanish civilization.

This commission was impressed by the fact that just four miles across the waters of Roanoke Sound from the site of old Fort Raleigh, are Kill Devil Hills, on the Carolina coast, where Congress has erected a memorial beacon commemorating the flight of the first heavier-than-air machine flown under its own power and carrying a passenger—the flight made by the brothers Orville and Wilbur Wright on December 17, 1903.

The beam from the beacon of the Wright Memorial, towering 161 feet above the sea level, casts its rays upon the site of the first English-speaking settlement in America.

It is a far cry from the tiny little barks of Sir Walter Raleigh's expedition to the conquest of the air, but the contrast is significant of the vast advance in physical progress following the simple beginnings of this civilization on Roanoke Island nearly 350 years ago.

This commission has considered all plans and suggestions which have been made to it and recommends that the ceremonies include the anniversary of the actual landing of the first Raleigh expedition. It is desired that the President of the United States shall be present and make an address. It is proposed to dedicate suitable markers at Roanoke Island and to hold appropriate ceremonies in order that the public may have an opportunity to learn through this means the deep historic significance of the place and the occasion.

In connection with the actual celebration at Roanoke Island the commission deems it advisable that an opportunity be given to hold local celebrations in cities, towns, and villages throughout the United States, and especially in the schools, to impress upon the minds of the American people the essential facts in relation to this first settlement of English-speaking people upon American soil.

With that opportunity in view, the commission recommends that it be empowered to conduct a nation-wide campaign of educational activities in the form of suitable celebrations, and especially of essay, declamatory, and oratorical contests in the public schools, with appropriate programs of ceremonies in connection therewith.

The commission finds that there is very little printed literature available dealing with this first settlement and therefore recommends that it be permitted to furnish to the schools and to the libraries such historical material as may be necessary to acquaint the public with the nature and the significance of the celebration.

The commission recommends that it be authorized, if the participation of other nations in the commemoration be deemed advisable, to communicate with the governments of such nations and arrange for such foreign participation.

The commission recommends that in planning and carrying out the celebration at Roanoke Island and elsewhere the commission be authorized to procure advice and assistance from any governmental agency, including the services of technical and other personnel in the executive departments and independent establishments, and to procure advice and assistance from and to cooperate with individuals and agencies, public and private.

The commission recommends that it be authorized to accept contributions of money and material and to allocate the same for expenditure in behalf of the various activities of the commission.

This commission recommends that all of the States, insular possessions, Territories, and the District of Columbia be requested, by appropriate presidential proclamations, to participate in the Roanoke Island celebration, and that all universities, colleges, and schools of all grades be requested to cooperate in commemorating this first English-speaking settlement in America.

The commission recommends that an official medal and a series of commemorative postage stamps be authorized in connection with the celebration.

The commission recommends that the Congress enact enabling legislation authorizing an appropriation of \$50,000 for the purposes of the celebration. This commission has given most studious consideration to the suggestions herein outlined and has kept clearly in mind the need for rigid economy in the development of that program. So careful have been the estimates that the commission feels it will be necessary to materially supplement the appropriation herein recommended, with substantial contributions from other sources.

This commission submits herewith suggestions for legislation in the form of tentative resolutions, and will supplement them by later reports and tentative bills or resolutions as occasion may demand.

This commission recommends that it be authorized and empowered to do all things necessary and appropriate to carry into effect any and all plans that may be adopted by Congress.

This commission fully realizes its responsibility to the Nation to make this celebration worthy of our country and its history, and it seeks to exalt the principles of political freedom, of a new birth in the world of a nation based upon liberty and justice to all.

It wishes to preserve the ideals upon which our institutions were founded and to inspire love of country and a devotion to those ideals.

It will recall to the younger generations the heroic struggles of the past by bringing to life those dramatic and outstanding world events springing from the first English settlement in America.

It will inspire in the American people, and especially the youth of our country, a new knowledge of our history and a new conception of what that history means to us to-day.

Truly, Roanoke Island was the birthplace of our Nation, and those stirring events which it is now sought to commemorate should be rescued from obscurity and made to live again in the hearts and minds of the American people.

JOSEPH T. ROBINSON, *Chairman*.
GEO. H. MOSES.
HARRY B. HAWES.
LINDSAY C. WARREN.
ISAAC BACHARACH.
SOL BLOOM.

COLUMBIA RIVER BRIDGE, OREGON

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, from the Committee on Commerce I report with amendment Senate bill 5357, to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River at or near Astoria, Oreg., and I submit a report (No. 1065) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. LONG. What is the bill?

Mr. VANDENBERG. It is a bridge bill, in regular form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COUZENS in the chair). Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The amendments were, in line 4, before the word "bridge," to strike out "the" and insert the article "a," and in line 7, before the word "act," to strike out "the" and insert the article "an," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River at or near Astoria, Oreg., authorized to be built by J. C. Tenbrook, as mayor of Astoria, Oreg., his successors in office and assigns, by an act of Congress approved June 10, 1930 (46 Stat. 540), are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from the date of approval hereof.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask leave to send to the desk a Senate resolution, which I will ask the clerk to read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the resolution.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 327), as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations be, and it is hereby, instructed by the Senate to reduce any and/or all appropriation bills sufficiently so that the aggregate of all appropriations for the fiscal year 1934 shall not be in excess of \$2,949,100,000,

which figure represents the total estimated revenue for the fiscal year 1934, and that no provision be made in any appropriation bill for any retirement of the national debt during said fiscal year 1934.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. LEWIS obtained the floor.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I would like to ask unanimous consent at this time to have considered a resolution which I have offered, if there is no objection. In view of the statement of the Senator from Virginia that he thinks the big banks of New York are undertaking to prevent the passage of the banking bill, and in view of our equally well-founded view, we think, a view which we think is in accord with the facts, that they are maintaining quite a lobby, and spending considerable money, for the passage of this legislation, I have offered a resolution to create a committee of five, to be appointed by the Chair, not more than three from any one political party—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield for that purpose?

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I was occupied for a moment in a conversation with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. BLAINE]. What is the request?

Mr. LONG. I read this morning in the paper a statement of the Senator from Virginia that the big banks are against the chain bank bill and other bank legislation which he has in the pending bill, and I have offered on the floor of the Senate a resolution to prove that the house of Morgan and others are doing what they can to pass this bill. I have introduced a resolution asking for an investigation by a Senate committee as to the expenditures and the lobby and efforts being made by these big banks, whether one way or the other, so as to determine just the exact facts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator from Louisiana that I desire to address myself for a moment to the resolution of the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], which has just been introduced, and which I catch the purport of as it was read; and I thought possibly 5 minutes, certainly not more than 10, would be enough for me to occupy. If it is just as satisfactory to the Senator from Louisiana, I will finish my observations, and then he may submit his resolution.

Mr. GLASS. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his inquiry.

Mr. GLASS. I have been out of the Chamber temporarily. Has the Senate disposed of the veto message of the President on the Philippine bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has not disposed of that.

Mr. GLASS. May any other business intervene until that can be disposed of?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Only by unanimous consent.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Virginia alludes to the resolution of the Senator from Louisiana, of that at this time I have nothing to say; but as to myself, I have taken the floor under the order of business which has prevailed, desiring to express a view. But I do not wish to mask the fact that I was stimulated to this at this very moment by the resolution introduced by the Senator from Maryland; but I avail myself to speak by adopting the privilege I have under the pending business. Is there objection on the part of the Senator from Virginia as to that?

Mr. GLASS. None at all, if it does not constitute business.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, the resolution tendered a moment past by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] invites me to the thought which I here express. The resolution indicates that the amount of appropriation shall not exceed the sum that shall be necessary to conduct the affairs of government as is now estimated by those having charge of some of the economy program.

Mr. President, I have seen in the public press that gentlemen, Members of this body—those who are members of my own political party—are intimating that progress in the new administration shall be begun at once by some general increase in all forms of taxes, and that there shall be such other courses taken to meet what is called the demand of the Budget looking to the raising of more revenue by whatever forms of new levy upon the different businesses of the United States of America.

I have also seen the intimation that, to carry this out, there should promptly be called what is denominated an extra session of Congress.

In the pursuit of the resolution of the Senator from Maryland, its spirit, as it is not now before the Senate, I desire to say that there will be no need of such extraordinary action if we, of the side on which I am honored to sit, in conjunction with those who are my colleagues on the other side of this Chamber, shall now proceed to consider the abolishment of the unnecessary departments of Government and the amalgamation of many other departments which are in themselves akin to each other. To illustrate, the Interior Department to be merged with the Agricultural Department, the complete abolishment of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Federal Trade Commission and the sending at once of rate contests to the courts, their executive duties to the Department of Commerce, and the complaint of anyone who has a sense of injustice as to rates should be heard promptly by the Federal court or any State court of authority, the court having the privilege to name a commissioner to investigate, as the Interstate Commerce Commission sends out special examiners now. This method I propose releases the expenses completely of that tribunal. This body of officials and its army has now, in my judgment, become perfectly unnecessary and wholly obsolete. Every decision made by them is the object of appeal to the courts, and therefore the cases should go to the courts in the first instance.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President—

Mr. LEWIS. May I be pardoned just a moment, and I will yield to the Senator.

The Commerce Department I would have take over matters having to do with all forms of commerce, by which we might dispense with vast numbers of employees, the whole theory of land irrigation of the interior, the great body of inspectors for the trade and industrial commission, the vast number of employees who now are like parasites feeding upon the Republic. Let them all be abolished and each complainant go direct to the courts for immediate and final relief.

Let there be investigation as to the departments which are not now necessary, and as fast as understood as unnecessary be abolished. We will by this save enough in funds to the Government to make unnecessary the levying of one penny of extra taxes upon the business of the country now. If these unnecessary and burdensome taxes are levied unjustly, they will prevent the business man from opening his factory for further employment of the unemployed. If we extract all he has in the form of something called taxation, that completely absorbs his possessions, he will have nothing with which he can continue business; and therefore unemployment, instead of being decreased, will be increased, because there will be the lack of encouragement in any line of commerce.

Let us turn our attention to the saving to this Government of those vast sums which are being paid out in the unnecessary engagement of bureaus which serve to-day merely as political harbors of refuge for those who, having nothing else to do, obtain political appointments by which they may live upon the Government.

Next, sir, this being done hastily will make unnecessary the suggestion of an extra session of Congress. I trust there will be no need of such session. I am wholly anxious that it shall not be called. Many laws passed lately I am greatly at variance with and in opposition to, but many of our citizens have tried to comply with them.

If an unnecessary session should be called and we should embark upon some new procedure in the general sense of

new legislation, we again unsettle everything that is fixed in any degree at present. The business interests become again in a diversified manner confused and quite unsettled as to their own relations to their business and to life itself. We will again awaken that general discordance and that attitude of uncertainty that will rob business of the permanence that is necessary to give employment or encourage industry.

Therefore, I am anxious that everything be done that can be to carry out the resolution of my eminent friend from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], or the spirit of it, if not literally. I wish that we all may avoid an extra session and give to the country the peace and quiet, that there may be some salutary effect, if only short and temporary. Let us quell in the mind of the people of the country the fears that they will have if they are confronted with continuing legislative sessions. Sirs, we have embarked upon a certain course of new business under a new administration that promises justice for all. Let us avoid what will be purely the tempestuous results of a new session with the certainty of undoing what is done and seeking to do something that is merely speculative as to what may be, with its uncertainty. The result would be that everything would be topsy-turvy in commercial life. In such state prosperity can not be revived, security can not be afforded, business can not be increased. Nothing in the form of permanence can be guaranteed.

Therefore, if we move to the abolishment of these extra institutions and the absorption of those that can be, we can now reduce the expenses of the Government \$100,000,000. We will not need to increase the taxes one dollar upon any citizen. We will start business with a new life, with a new spirit; and if there be no extra session of Congress, there will be that pacification of the general public mind and we will cause our public to feel that we have entered upon a new era, not only of peace and quietude and confidence but one of hope, confidence, and prosperity. I am anxious that the resolution tendered by my friend from Maryland shall take such course as shall readily put it upon its successful passage.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. LEWIS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I understand the Senator recommends doing away with the Interstate Commerce Commission. Did I correctly understand the Senator?

Mr. LEWIS. The Senator did. I do not know that I used exactly the Senator's words, "doing away." I would abolish it.

Mr. LONG. I take it that that means doing away with it.

Mr. LEWIS. I merely reply that if the Senator understood me to mean "doing away" by "abolishing," that is what I meant.

Mr. LONG. Would the Senator just turn the railroads loose or would he have some restraint over them?

Mr. LEWIS. I would turn into the courts the power to hear every dispute and would promptly enact into law a provision giving precedence to every shipper having complaints—to have the right to go to the court nearest him, to have a hearing on the question at once and have the dispute determined judicially, to be followed by the railroads in obedience or disobedience with the results that would follow.

Mr. LONG. I did not know that there was any other Senator having that attitude. I want to ask the Senator a further question. Does he think in this day of water transportation and air transportation and road transportation, all three of which are practically owned by the Government, it will be possible for the railroads ever to become extricated unless there is something done with the Interstate Commerce Commission?

Mr. LEWIS. My judgment is that those loans which are being advanced to the railroads by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation which we created here—the money that is advanced to the railroads borrowing in the form of

loans—will not be repaid. That the roads will not repay the money in any part at any time. The result will be that the Government sooner or later will be compelled to take first supervision and then ownership. When such starts, it will mean universal ownership, and those institutions described by the Senator will all be combined, and we will find ourselves in an era of government ownership of all transportation.

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. LEWIS. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. LOGAN. The Senator has expressed a very laudable hope that we may be able to reduce the expenses of government to the point where the income will balance the expenses. I understand that to be the purpose of the resolution introduced by the Senator from Maryland. May I ask the Senator if there is any way, in his judgment, that we could make any material reduction in governmental expenses except through the elimination of governmental activities?

Mr. LEWIS. I accept the suggestion of the eminent Senator from Kentucky. He has described, by using a very fitting phrase, "governmental activities," the very institutions to which I allude. Those institutions which are "governmental activities," political in purpose, should be promptly abolished, as many as possible. By removing them we remove the expenses that are necessary to maintain them.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. LEWIS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I ask the attention of the Senator from Kentucky. As I take it the Senator from Kentucky would indicate that we have to lose something when we do eliminate the governmental activities.

Mr. LOGAN. I mean we will never be able to do very much in the way of reduction of expenses by pecking around the edges, like reducing salaries a little bit and cutting out some little thing here and there, but we must abolish bureaus, boards, departments, and establishments by actually eliminating the activities in which they are engaged, and we can not reduce expenses materially in any other way. I agree fully with all the Senator from Illinois has said.

Mr. LEWIS. To which I have only to add, in the language of Macbeth:

"If it were done when 'tis done, then 'twere well
It were done quickly."

PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE—PRESIDENT'S VETO MESSAGE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7233) to enable the people of the Philippine Islands to adopt a constitution and form a government for the Philippine Islands, to provide for the independence of the same, and for other purposes, returned by the President of the United States with his objections to the House of Representatives in which it originated.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation? What is the pending question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. LONG. That is the pending business now?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the question now before the Senate.

Mr. LONG. I do not want to prevent any other Senator from speaking on the pending question.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. Certainly.

Mr. BLAINE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. LONG. I would prefer not to yield for that purpose at this time, because I may have to speak myself, and I would not want to bring any Senator into the Chamber to hear me who did not want to do so. I wish to make a few remarks on the pending measure. I shall be as brief as possible about it, but if there is some other Senator who desires to speak on the Philippine question this evening, I shall not put myself in his way but will let him proceed.

However, if there is no other Senator who wants to speak at this particular time, I have a few words to say relative to the matter.

I offered several amendments to the bill. In one I cut down the allowable amount of sugar that could be imported into this country from the Philippines free of tariff. I believe I cut the quantity down to about 610,000 tons of raw and refined sugar. I also proposed an amendment to the coconut-oil provision. I have at this time forgotten just what was the quantity of coconut oil to be allowed under my amendment, but I cut it down, as my memory serves me, to about two-fifths of what was allowed in the bill. My amendment was adopted by the Senate, after a little argument and great deal of discussion. I allowed more coconut oil to be brought into this country than is being shipped now. That is the amount my amendment would have allowed to come in free of tariff. I also allowed more sugar than had been brought in here free of tariff at the time the bill was being first agitated, I might say.

When the bill went to conference, the conference committee struck out the two provisions that I had inserted in the bill. They agreed with the House, or rather they got the House to agree with them. All the conferees were favorable to the House provision and there does not seem to have been very much trouble about it.

I had proposed to eliminate the plebiscite by giving a plebiscite in advance. I had further proposed to shorten the years from 20 down to 10 or 12. When the conferees came back while I was away they made it 10 years instead of a 12-year period before freedom should begin. While I did not feel they should have yielded so readily on my amendments cutting down the quantities of coconut oil and sugar, yet the fact that they had cut off a couple of years somewhat compensated for the other action taken by the conferees.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. BINGHAM. The bill as reported by the conferees permitted a less quantity of free sugar over the whole period than the bill as it went out of the Senate, and that is also true with reference to coconut oil, so that although in two years the total amount is smaller, the farmers of the country benefit from the provisions of the bill as reported by the conferees.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator. That fact, together with the cutting down of the time by two years, I think all in all really gave us at least as good a bill, if not a better bill.

Mr. President, we all know that there would have been a much shorter period for independence written into the bill had it not been that we were trying to satisfy the President of the United States. It was the fact that his veto threatened to kill the measure that caused us to grant as long a time as we did, because it was suggested that if we did not allow at least 10 years the President of the United States would veto the bill. Except for that, as I have said, my opinion is that the Senate without any doubt at all would have approved a bill granting freedom to the Filipinos in 3 or 4 or 5 years. I am very much disappointed at the President's action. Having yielded on the question of time and having yielded, so far as certain Senators from the West and I are concerned, the other provisions I have just mentioned, I think it was very unfortunate the President should have vetoed this bill because of one further matter.

I think it is pretty well known—at any rate, it is a matter of common gossip among us in the Senate, though I do not know that any of us have any positive proof about it—that the incoming President would readily sign a bill to free the Philippine Islands within a much shorter period. I would hazard the guess that after the 4th of March we would be safe in saying that President Roosevelt will sign a bill granting independence to the Philippines within perhaps five years. I am one of those expecting to vote to override the veto, and I think we should override it, but, even though the

veto of the President of the United States should be sustained, my frank opinion is that at the most Philippine independence will not be delayed a single day and the chances are it will be expedited. I frankly say, Mr. President, that I really believe that if we were to sustain the veto, the Philippines would probably be freed quicker than if the veto should be overridden.

We have been fighting for Philippine independence and promising it for a long time, as the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] has said in his very illuminating speech. We have been discussing this question in the Senate for at least 32 years, and I for one should like to see the matter disposed of and the Filipinos made certain as to what their status will be. They have been told for years to get ready for independence. From time to time Congress has debated independence bills and then passed nothing, and if we should not override the veto, Mr. President, they would be in a similar position to that of a mariner with no port, drifting around on uncharted seas, not knowing from one day to the next under what law they would be living, not knowing what would be done, no matter what they want done, and subject to the attitude of the party which may be in power and two years later, if another party should be placed in power (and as to that they would have no say) subject to the action which might be taken by that party. The President might die, and then there would be another President, whose views might be different from those of his predecessor. Then no one knows when the Governor General of the Philippines is going to be called back and somebody else put in his place. So there is constant uncertainty.

Regardless of whether we want to give the Philippines independence in 5 years or 10 years or 12 years or 15 years, this bill, though it is called a compromise by the Senator from Michigan, is about as good a bill, in my opinion, as we are ever going to get, and certainly the United States under this bill will train the Filipinos as much as under any other.

Mr. President, from what I have been able to judge, I think that probably the President's veto will be overridden by a majority of two over the necessary two-thirds, but I realize how uncertain some of us are at times even on important questions, and I realize how dangerously close our vacillating temperaments might make the vote on this bill.

I particularly have in mind the position taken by Senators, such as the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING]. I agree almost entirely with what that Senator has said. I think he understands this matter very thoroughly, but we on this side of the Chamber, Mr. President, who have supported the Democratic Party at all in any campaign, certainly know that there has been no pledge ever made by our party as regularly and consistently as our pledge for the immediate independence of the Philippine Islands.

Many of us who serve in this body have been delegates to the national conventions of the party, and I say it is a tribute to the Democratic Party that it has so regularly and so consistently, and, I might add, so overwhelmingly, probably unanimously, advocated immediate independence of the Philippine Islands, and as Democrats we ought to be proud of the fact that our brethren on the other side of the aisle have gradually come over during the course of years until even the Republican platform itself declared for a plebiscite on the question of independence for the Filipinos.

Mr. President, I am sorry my friend, the Senator from Michigan, has left the Chamber, but that is all this bill is; it is merely a plebiscite, and provides the means and methods for holding such plebiscite. Those provisions are well expressed in the bill. All we have done is to say to the Filipinos, "Draft a constitution for yourselves; outline for yourselves a form of government in accordance with this bill; submit it to your people and let them vote whether they wish to live under the constitution so framed or under the American flag as they now are. If they wish to live under their own government, let them adopt the constitution; but if they do not, then let them live under our flag."

We are not freeing the Filipinos; we are not even carrying out in full the democratic platform; we are giving the Fili-

pinos a chance to set up their own government. If they want to be free and to exist under their own government we are giving them that right.

The President of the United States is in a mist of misunderstanding, and, I might say, is in ignorance of the law relating to this bill when he gives as one of his reasons for vetoing it that the people of the Philippines ought to have a plebiscite. The bill is no more than a plebiscite at best. What does he want to do? Does he want to have a vote taken in the Philippines to-morrow and then, if they decide they want to be free, to have us provide the terms under which they may be free. After we have debated the question for 32 years, and the Filipino people have waited that long, why not let them know what kind of government they are going to live under at the time they vote? Certainly, Mr. President, it is eminently more fair to us and to them that we should say when they vote their freedom, "Here is the kind of government you are going to have if you choose to be free." If I were a native of the Philippine Islands, I might hesitate, though I do not think I would, on the question of independence if I did not know under what kind of government I was going to live; but under this bill we have done away with any such apprehension, Mr. President, and so far as the plebiscite is concerned, I think it is the fairest and best and most complete that we could possibly adopt.

I have a certain pride in the bill; I helped to some extent to frame the plebiscite provision. I was satisfied with it; and I thought when we had finally evolved a means by which the people of the Philippine Islands could speak on this question that we had provided the fairest and most comprehensive and most reasonable and, from a legal standpoint, the most logical form of plebiscite that could possibly be written into a Philippine independence bill.

Mr. President, I do not understand the President of the United States. He has vetoed the same kind of a plebiscite that has been employed in connection with the admission of all the States that have come into the Union since the thirteen Colonies were formed into a nation. He has condemned this as an undemocratic and un-American method of releasing them, when it provides for the same means employed in connection with the admission of every State into the Union, with the exception of the thirteen original Colonies.

How did we let the last State into the Union? The first thing the people of a territory seeking statehood had to do was to get up a government, just as this bill provides for the Philippine Islands. The constitution drafted was submitted to the people and the people voted on whether they wanted to become a State in the American Union under the constitution so presented to them or whether they wanted to remain a territory and not have the constitution.

Some one may say that that is an empty formality. It is, and it is not; at times it is, and at times it is not. I recall that when Oklahoma was admitted into the Union, as I am sure the distinguished Senators from that State who are here will recall, there was written into the constitution of Oklahoma a provision that under statehood intoxicating liquors could never be sold in that State. That question was submitted to the electorate of the Indian Territory and Oklahoma Territory and the people there were told: "If you want to exist as one of the sovereign American States, as a dry State at that, then we will give you that right, but if you do not want a dry State you can not be admitted under this constitution. There was the most intense argument and considerable debate during that plebiscite as to whether they had not better defeat that constitution rather than to live under the dry clause in it for which they had to vote in order to obtain statehood.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of making a motion for a recess?

Mr. LONG. Yes, sir.

RECESS

Mr. McNARY. I move that the Senate now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, January 16, 1933, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, January 10), 1933

FOREIGN SERVICE

Harold B. Quarton, of Iowa, now a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a consul, to be a consul general of the United States of America.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE ARMY

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

First Lieut. Wallace Ellsworth Niles, Infantry (detailed in Ordnance Department), with rank from August 4, 1926.

TO INFANTRY

Maj. Eugene Manuel Landrum, Adjutant General's Department, with rank from November 16, 1927.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY

TO BE CAPTAIN

First Lieut. William Edward Smith, Infantry, from January 11, 1933.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS

Second Lieut. William Hamilton Hunter, Cavalry, from January 7, 1933.

Second Lieut. Francis Cecil Foster, Field Artillery, from January 11, 1933.

PROMOTION IN THE NAVY

TO BE REAR ADMIRAL

Capt. Alfred W. Johnson to be a rear admiral in the Navy, from the 1st day of February, 1933.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, JANUARY 14, 1933

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Spera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We praise Thee, Almighty God, that Thou art the everlasting Father, the Creator of all the ends of the earth, who fainteth not, neither is weary. Oh, guard our hearts; watch over these eager, hungry, passionate hearts of ours. Tune them at the source of all melody, goodness, and joy, and they shall be sweeter than the dream music that floats above the hills of God. Lord God of the nations, be pleased to hearken: Our country rose into being in conviction, devotion, enthusiasm, and sacrifice. Oh, spare this generation from living on the life made by the breath of others. When the hours of the day are over, merciful Father, flood all hearts and minds with the silver light of a perfect peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 38. Concurrent resolution for a joint session of the two Houses for appropriate exercises in commemora-

tion of the life, character, and public service of the late President Calvin Coolidge.

PROPOSED BILL FOR THE ISSUANCE OF UNITED STATES BONDS TO BE USED AS SECURITY FOR FEDERAL RESERVE NOTES

Mr. BUSBY. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill to provide for the issuance of United States bonds to be used as security for the issuance of Federal Reserve notes and to provide for the use of such notes.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on that bill, and to include as a part of those remarks the bill itself, which is short.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBY. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to provide for the issuance of United States bonds to be used as security for the issuance of Federal reserve notes and to provide for the use of such notes.

STATEMENT ON THE PROVISION OF THE BILL

The Committee on Currency Reform Legislation of the Open Forum has drafted a bill and presented the same to the forum for its discussion and consideration.

The bill has for its purpose, as the title indicates, to supply currency to supplement the slowed-down use of bank credits and currency now outstanding. Its main provisions are:

First. To authorize in the usual and accepted manner \$3,000,000,000 Government bonds which shall bear 1 per cent interest per annum. These bonds are to be issued \$1,000,000,000 within 30 days after the enactment of this bill, an additional billion dollars within 60 days after the enactment of the bill, and if the wholesale commodity index price level had not risen to 80 per cent of the price-level average for the period of 1921-1929 within 150 days after the enactment, then the third \$1,000,000,000 shall be issued and used for the purpose for which the whole issue is intended.

Second. Immediately after the bonds are issued they shall be transferred by the Secretary of the Treasury to the Federal reserve agents of the several banks, the Federal Reserve Board determining the amount which shall go to each agent. The Comptroller of the Currency shall deliver in the ordinary and usual way the usual and approved Federal reserve notes in amounts equal to the amount of the bonds transferred to the reserve agent for such bank. The bank shall immediately issue said reserve notes and transfer them to the Secretary of the Treasury, that is, pay them into the Treasury to be used by him to pay the expenses and current obligations of the Government.

Third. The notes to be issued shall be backed by 100 per cent Government obligations or bonds, with an added 20 per cent of gold, as a basis for the issuance of the new currency, the bonds shall mature in 10 years, be callable after two years, and as to sinking fund, payment, exemption from taxation, and so forth, be in all respects as if issued to be sold on the open market in the ordinary way as an ordinary bond issue.

Fourth. These Federal reserve notes shall be identical with other Federal reserve notes issued and in all respects be subject to the general provisions of law dealing with the issuance, redemption, and so forth. The purpose of the bill will be to provide additional circulating medium for the country in the most sound and approved way possible to issue currency.

I might explain that the Open Forum is a gathering of Members of Congress of all political parties. Every Member of the House is eligible to participate in its proceedings. The present membership of the Forum is something more than 100, and is growing each week. The bill I have introduced has been approved by the Committee on Currency and Currency Reform. This is a committee of the Open Forum; and the Forum has also heard and considered this bill. We will go immediately to the chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency and secure hearings on the bill. We hope to secure its passage in the House at the earliest possible date.